

**WestEd Analysis of •**

# **Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program**



# WestEd Analysis of Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program

October 2005

---

Prepared by the Policy Center at WestEd

Paul Koehler, Director

Reino Makkonen, Research Assistant

Travis Vincent, Administrative Assistant

Edward Sloat, Statistical Consultant

WestEd

## Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Utah State Office of Education officials Christine Kearl, Lynne Greenwood, Brett Moulding, and Jerry Winkler for their assistance in developing this report; Colleen Montoya, WestEd Senior Communicator, for serving as editor; Rosemary De La Torre, who handled proofreading; Christian Holden, WestEd Design Director, who created the cover art; and Fredrika Baer, WestEd Graphic Designer, who designed the report.

## About the Policy Center at WestEd

WestEd's Policy Center assists policymakers in the Western Regional Educational Laboratory's four-state region — Arizona, California, Nevada, and Utah. The Center provides research-based policy analyses of current trends in education reform and highlights research developments benefiting children and families.

## About WestEd

WestEd, a national nonprofit research, development, and service agency, works with education and other communities to promote excellence, achieve equity, and improve learning for children, youth, and adults. WestEd has 15 offices nationwide, from Washington and Boston to Arizona and California. Its corporate headquarters are in San Francisco. For more information about WestEd, visit our website: [WestEd.org](http://WestEd.org); call 415.615.3000 or, toll-free, (877) 4-WestEd; or write: WestEd / 730 Harrison Street / San Francisco, CA 94107-1242.

For more information about this report, please contact the WestEd Policy Center at (602) 322-7000.

## Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION 1	
The Utah K-3 Reading Improvement Program at a Glance	2
SECTION 2	
Self-Reported S.B. 230 Program Information	7
SECTION 3	
First-Year Proficiency Goals, Summative Assessments, and Results	44
SECTION 4	
What Has Been Accomplished?	60
ENDNOTES	63
APPENDIX A	
S.B. 230 Enrolled Copy (State of Utah 2004 General Session)	65
APPENDIX B	
S.B. 230 State and Local Funding, FY2005 and FY2006	69





## INTRODUCTION

In 2004, the Utah State Legislature enacted a bill (S.B. 230) creating the K-3 Reading Improvement Program. Under this law, the state provides matching funds to help districts and charter schools implement literacy plans that will ensure the state's third graders read at or above grade level.<sup>1</sup> Focusing on early literacy as the key to academic success, the program prevents reading deficiencies from taking hold. (See Appendix A for the full text of the S.B. 230 legislation.) In the first year, all 40 Utah school districts took part in the K-3 Reading Improvement Program, as did 7 of the state's charter schools.<sup>2</sup>

This report, prepared independently by WestEd at the request of Utah Superintendent of Public Instruction Patti Harrington, looks at the implementation of the K-3 Reading Improvement Program and its first-year results. WestEd analyzed the year-end Annual Reading Proficiency Reports provided by participating districts and charter schools — along with reports provided by the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) — to determine a) how participants have thus far complied with the provisions of the state legislation, and b) the effects of the program after one year of implementation. (Previous USOE presentations on the self-reported results of the S.B. 230 program delivered in June and September 2005 were based on raw, preliminary data.) WestEd also reviewed 2004 and 2005 Utah Language Arts Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) results to assess whether the first-year effects of the S.B. 230 reading initiative were reflected in statewide assessments.\*

The report is organized into 4 sections. Section 1 presents a summary review of the program, focusing on the elements specified in the S.B. 230 legislation: assessment, intervention strategies, professional development, reading performance standards, and specific measurable goals. Section 2 describes the first-year inputs, outputs, and outcomes reported to the USOE by participants, while Section 3 outlines K-3 assessment results, both self-reported and statewide. Section 4 features WestEd's observations on the program's overall progress in year one.

---

\* Several important caveats must be considered when assessing the K-3 Reading Improvement Program via the Utah Language Arts CRT. First, the CRT evaluates students' reading, writing, and listening skills as outlined in the state's Core Curriculum; it does not isolate reading progress, the stated goal of S.B. 230. Furthermore, many districts focused their literacy improvement efforts on the kindergarten level, where no statewide CRT assessment is available.

## SECTION 1: The Utah K-3 Reading Improvement Program at a Glance

### *The Role of the Utah State Office of Education*

The Utah State Office of Education guided the statewide implementation of the K-3 Reading Improvement Program. Seeking to inspire districts to expand their literacy efforts and take fuller advantage of existing early reading initiatives, the USOE offered a variety of support materials and professional development. For example, it hosted literacy institutes and summits and offered quarterly training for school reading coaches. It also released the statewide K-3 Literacy Framework for Successful Instruction and Intervention, published templates and evaluation rubrics for district reading plans, and offered its approved listing of literacy assessments and early reading guidelines.<sup>3</sup> In short, the USOE sought to counsel participating districts and charter schools on research-based uses of program funds.

To receive state monies under S.B. 230, prospective participants had to match the funds with an amount based on a USOE formula. Many districts raised taxes to accomplish this.<sup>4</sup> (For a breakdown of state and local S.B. 230 funding in fiscal years 2005 and 2006, see Appendix B.) Prior to using program monies, participating districts and charter schools had to submit reading improvement plans that incorporated assessment tools, intervention strategies, professional development, reading performance standards, and specific measurable goals.<sup>5</sup> Each is discussed below.

### *Assessment Tools*

According to the USOE's K-3 Literacy Framework, districts and schools are expected "to identify appropriate assessment tools to screen, diagnose, and monitor student progress."<sup>6</sup> With no common assessment outlined in the S.B. 230 legislation, the districts and charter schools participating in the K-3 Reading Improvement Program used a variety of formative and summative measures, usually in combination, to monitor and assess students' reading progress.

At kindergarten, more than half of the participants used the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), a set of standardized, individually administered measures of early literacy development. DIBELS are one-minute fluency measures used to regularly monitor the development of pre-reading and early reading skills, such as letter naming and phoneme segmentation. Other kindergarten assessments used by participants included the Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), the Texas Primary Reading Inventory (TPRI), and the Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI), as well as local grade-level assessments developed by individual districts or schools. Many school districts, including Carbon County, Grand County, North Summit, Rich, South Summit, and Tintic, used multiple assessment instruments to measure kindergarteners' reading progress.



Utah's Language Arts CRTs are administered at the end of the school year in grades 1-3 to measure learning outcomes and progress over time. As the Utah Core Curriculum "clearly defines what all students should know and be able to do at the various grade levels within the critical areas of the literacy process,"<sup>7</sup> most participants — 41 of 47 — used the summative Language Arts CRT as part of their S.B. 230 assessment strategy. Additional measures used to assess the reading progress of students in grades 1-3 included DIBELS, DRA, QRI, the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills, and district- or school-developed grade-level measures. Over half of the participants used multiple assessment measures to evaluate and monitor their students' progress at grades 1-3. (See Section 3 for a more detailed breakdown of both the assessments used by each program participant and reported results.)

### *Reading Interventions*

According to the K-3 Literacy Framework, if all students are to be successful readers, "early and appropriate intervention with research-based practices is critical."<sup>8</sup> Utah's model for providing targeted reading intervention and practice is known as Tiered Instruction. Tier 1 refers to the instruction delivered by the classroom teacher for 2-3 hours daily, while Tier 2 comprises supplemental, small group instruction, often delivered by the school literacy coach, that addresses the needs of students who are not proficient readers. Tier 3 refers to intensive intervention with the most at-risk readers (approximately 2 to 5 percent of students) who have not responded adequately to Tier 2 intervention. Tier 3 students usually have severe reading difficulties and receive intervention from a special education teacher, often outside the regular classroom.<sup>9</sup>

Under S.B. 230, participating districts and charters expanded their Tiered Instruction efforts to assist struggling readers by developing a variety of literacy interventions. Most used state funds to put more literacy staff into classrooms, hiring additional reading specialists, coaches, or aides to assist with reading interventions (such as supplemental instruction/tutoring and small group instruction) as well as monitor progress. In addition, teachers developed individual student improvement plans and worked to differentiate reading instruction. Participants also invested in school-based reading interventions before school, after school, or in the summer; leveled reading libraries or guided reading; peer or cross-age tutoring programs; and Reading Recovery and Early/Next Steps interventions.

For example, to enhance its literacy intervention program, the Davis School District provided workshops on instructional practices for early literacy development. Thus, reading teachers were trained to use literacy materials more effectively and implement intervention strategies, including using multi-sensory techniques to address the needs of low-performing students. Teachers then instructed students in concepts of print, phonemic awareness, letter identification, word knowledge, and comprehension, while also regularly assessing

and monitoring students' progress. In the Logan City School District, full-time reading aides were hired to provide small group Tier 2 instruction to at-risk kindergarten students as part of the extended kindergarten day. Moreover, every K-3 teacher at Logan had access to Early Success or Soar to Success intervention materials, and substitutes were provided bi-monthly so teachers could attend an eight-week guided reading course. (See Section 2 for a more detailed listing of the specific interventions used by program participants.)

### *Professional Development*

The Utah K-3 Literacy Framework states that districts "should provide ongoing professional development regarding the administration, monitoring, and application of data to guide instructional practices."<sup>10</sup> Virtually all participating districts and charters used S.B. 230 program monies to support professional development in literacy. Most hired literacy coaches and/or reading specialists to help teachers take full advantage of the district's new reading intervention materials or practices and more effectively teach core literacy skills like phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary. Districts and schools also trained teachers to use literacy assessments such as DIBELS and the DRA in a formative way, using data to differentiate instruction and design interventions for struggling readers. (See Section 2 for a listing of the specific professional development activities undertaken by individual program participants.)

### *Reading Performance Standards*

Students in participating districts and charter schools were expected to meet the primary standards (and accompanying objectives) included in the USOE Language Arts Core Curriculum for grades K-3: phonemic awareness; phonics and spelling; fluency; vocabulary; and comprehension.

### *Specific Measurable Goals*

Under S.B. 230, districts' improvement plans must incorporate specific measurable goals based upon students' gain scores. There is no state standard for progress under this program, however, as the law leaves goal setting to participants. Student performance targets thus varied by participant — often as a result of the differing literacy assessments used — with some districts or charters setting tougher goals than others. (See Section 3 for a more detailed listing of the proficiency goals set by program participants.)

Nonetheless, the overall objective of the S.B. 230 legislation is to ensure all of the state's third graders read at or above grade level. Thus, participants sought continuous improvement marked by increases in the overall percentages of students reading at the proficient level in each grade. Although districts administered formative assessments and set performance goals throughout the school year, summative gain score targets were

primarily tied to the end-of-level assessments given in the spring. And as noted previously, DIBELS and the Utah CRT were most commonly used to measure students' reading progress.

Based on nationally normed benchmark scores, the DIBELS end-of-year assessments include three levels of proficiency: Deficit/At Risk, Emergent/Some Risk, and Established/Low Risk. S.B. 230 participants using DIBELS assessments set goals that either related to gains in the number of students achieving a benchmark score or a proficiency level. For example, districts reported such benchmark-related goals as "10% fewer students not at benchmark in Spring 2005 than in Spring 2004" and a "5% increase in number of students reading at benchmark." Others sought such performance-level improvements as "80% scoring Some Risk or better" and "less than 15% At Risk."

Administered at the end of the school year, Utah's Language Arts CRTs assess the knowledge and skills of students in reading, writing, and listening as outlined in the state's Core Curriculum. The CRTs compare an individual student's performance against the curriculum and indicate mastery of subject matter taught. Performance levels are tied to the "cut score" for passing, which differs at each grade level.

- Level 1: Minimal (at least one standard deviation<sup>11</sup> below the cut score)
- Level 2: Partial (no more than one standard deviation below the cut score)
- Level 3: Sufficient (equal to the established cut score)
- Level 4: Substantial (scoring at least one standard deviation above the cut score)

With students scoring in Levels 3 and 4 on the CRT considered proficient on Utah's Language Arts standards, S.B. 230 participants commonly sought consistent increases in the percentages of students scoring in the proficient range at each grade level. (Improvement trajectories obviously differed due to varying baseline scores among participants.) Most districts and charters are seeking to have a high percentage (usually 75-95 percent) of their students scoring proficient on the CRT by 2007, while others simply are looking for consistent yearly improvements.

### *Summary of First-Year Results*

Although reading proficiency goals varied by participant — with some districts and charters setting tougher targets than others — the self-reported first-year results are encouraging. According to the year-end program information provided to WestEd by the USOE in Summer/Fall 2005, 31 districts and 3 charter schools reported their students met all first-year reading goals in kindergarten, while 23 districts and 4 charters met their goals at grade 1. At grade 2, 24 districts and 3 charters reported meeting their first-year

goals, while 26 districts and 3 charters did so at grade 3. Twelve districts and 1 charter school reported meeting all of their K-3 proficiency goals.

Data from the Utah Language Arts CRT are also promising. In only the first year of program implementation, 20 participants saw increases in their overall grade 1 language arts proficiency rate (percentage achieving Levels 3 and 4) from 2004 to 2005. Twenty-eight participants raised their proficiency rates at grade 2, while 24 did so at grade 3. Notably, 6 school districts and 1 charter school saw higher 2005 proficiency rates at all 3 primary grades. The following table offers additional details on the scale of CRT proficiency rate improvements.

CRT Proficiency Rate Improvements, SY2003-04 to SY2004-05

	+ 0-4%	+ 4-8%	+ 8-12%	+12% or more
Grade 1 (20)	11	4	1	4
Grade 2 (28)	19	4	2	3
Grade 3 (24)	14	5	3	2

(Section 3 of this report offers further detail on first-year program results.)

## SECTION 2: Self-Reported S.B. 230 Program Information

### *Inputs/Uses of Program Funds*

In Year 1, S.B. 230 funds were used in a variety of ways, including:

- hiring literacy specialists and coaches as well as additional reading support personnel in elementary schools;
- purchasing new instructional materials and assessment tools;
- offering literacy professional development to school staff and parents; and
- providing full-day kindergarten.

### *Activities/Program Outputs*

During the first year of the program, participating districts and charter schools engaged in a variety of literacy efforts, including:

- literacy professional development sessions;
- parent training events;
- collaborative teacher meetings on pedagogy;
- summer school and before- and after-school tutoring; and
- the implementation of new assessment tools to guide reading instruction and track student progress.

### *Program Outcomes*

Not surprisingly, the most common long-term goal of program participants is to ensure all students read proficiently at K-3. (This is, after all, the primary intent of the S.B. 230 legislation.) But short-term objectives did vary among participants, and included:

- increasing teacher and principal literacy expertise;
- coordinating materials, services, and personnel to support struggling readers; and
- increasing the use of assessment data to guide instruction.

## SCHOOL DISTRICTS<sup>12</sup>

### ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT

<b>Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 full-time literacy coaches</li> <li>• Training session with nationally recognized oral language development expert</li> <li>• Professional development for teachers on phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, oral language, writing, and using the DRA assessment</li> <li>• Literacy training for principals and parents</li> <li>• Classroom leveled libraries (nonfiction guided reading books)</li> <li>• Reading Recovery (RR): 2 new RR teacher leaders, 2 new RR teachers hired, 16 RR teachers moved from half- to full-time, one half-time intervention specialist hired to train RR teachers on small group instruction</li> <li>• DRA online management system</li> <li>• Literacy-focused summer school program</li> </ul>
<b>Activities/ Program Outputs</b>	<p><b><u>Literacy Coaches</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Met weekly with district curriculum specialists and professional development directors to coordinate priorities</li> <li>• Met with school teams during weekly collaboration time to review student assessment data, set goals, and provide instructional support to individual teachers</li> <li>• Worked with individual teachers in classrooms to demonstrate and observe instructional practices focused on raising student achievement</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Teachers</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attended training sessions on district literacy framework and teaching with fidelity to Utah Core Curriculum</li> <li>• Received targeted training in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, oral language, and writing</li> <li>• Attended awareness sessions in oral language development</li> <li>• Received intensive instruction in assessing oral language development and implementing oral language development groups (in 2 schools with highest ELL populations)</li> <li>• Purchased books on many difficulty levels that will be readily available in classrooms for students to read independently</li> <li>• Developed individual improvement plans for each student not proficient on CRT; updated 3 times a year</li> <li>• Trained to administer DRA</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Reading Recovery (RR)</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 new RR teacher leaders trained 15 new RR teachers to implement reading interventions for at-risk 1st graders</li> <li>• 16 RR teachers assessed students' need for small group instruction in K-3 and provided intensive literacy instruction to identified students</li> <li>• RR teachers working with small groups attended monthly training sessions with the intervention specialist</li> <li>• Books purchased for use by RR teachers for use with students and small groups</li> <li>• New books bought and added to materials used by RR teachers</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Intervention</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elementary tutoring programs evaluated</li> <li>• Resource and K-1 teachers attended session on administering Observation Survey</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Principals and Parents</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principals attended training on developing effective school intervention team</li> <li>• Elementary principals attended summer training on literacy programs and goals</li> <li>• Parents invited to attend district literacy conference</li> <li>• Schools received guidelines, materials, and support for local parent workshops</li> <li>• Schools invited to use standards-based report card at grades K and 1; several schools piloted standards-based report card at grade 2</li> </ul>



## SCHOOL DISTRICTS<sup>12</sup>

### ALPINE SCHOOL DISTRICT *(continued)*

Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will understand how to use assessment data to identify students that need additional help to become proficient in literacy as demonstrated on CRT</li> <li>• Will become aware of improved instructional practices that can help prevent reading failure</li> <li>• Will regularly evaluate progress of students at risk of reading failure</li> <li>• Understand importance of oral language to literacy development</li> <li>• Evaluate how well they're teaching UT Core Curriculum</li> <li>• Will form intervention teams to collaborate on instructional strategies for students struggling with literacy</li> <li>• Will be able to administer the Observation Survey</li> <li>• Will communicate with RR teachers on student strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Will plan specific interventions across settings</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will spend more time independently reading appropriately leveled texts</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals and Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Principals will increase their understanding of how to support quality literacy programs in their schools</li> <li>• Parents will see themselves as partners in their children's education</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will plan and implement specific strategies to help students improve their literacy, based on students' individual strengths and weaknesses</li> <li>• Will increase their expertise in research and instructional strategies in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension, oral language, writing</li> <li>• Will implement improved instructional practices in their classrooms, resulting in increased student learning</li> <li>• Will help ELL students increase their proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in English</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More independent reading will lead to increased proficiency in literacy</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have the information and skills needed to actively support their children in literacy acquisition</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will have the data needed to adequately screen students, leading to quick and accurate diagnosis and timely and effective intervention</li> <li>• Will identify students in need of additional assistance early and provide appropriate support to enable them to achieve proficiency in Utah Core Curriculum</li> <li>• Will bring students up to proficiency level via additional assistance or enroll them in Tier 2 intervention</li> <li>• Will teach with fidelity to the Utah Core Curriculum</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The percentage of K students not passing DRA level 3 will be below 25%</li> <li>• The number of grade 1 students not reaching proficiency on CRT will be decreased by 10%</li> <li>• Students in grades 2-3 will reduce their achievement gap by 5%</li> <li>• More students will have quality learning experiences in their homes and preschools in the years before they attend public school</li> <li>• ELL students will increase their capacity to listen, speak, read, and write English</li> </ul>
------------------	--

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
BEAVER COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-time literacy specialist hired to implement district's elementary literacy program</li> <li>• Six part-time reading aides hired to assist in K-3 classes</li> <li>• Professional development provided for literacy specialist, reading aides (tutoring instruction), and K-3 teachers (literacy skills; scientifically-based reading research; use of DIBELS, DRA)</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Specialist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on essentials necessary to implement district literacy model</li> <li>• Received instruction on effective scientifically based reading research (SBRR) practices, assessments, Utah Core Curriculum implementation and mastery, and tiered instruction</li> <li>• Provided SBRR instruction for teachers and aides</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with district literacy specialist to review assessment data and develop practices/interventions to support struggling readers</li> <li>• Trained (along with reading aides) to administer and interpret DIBELS, DRA, QRI assessments</li> <li>• Trained to use SBRR practices to determine when Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions were appropriate</li> <li>• Attended professional development sessions on Utah's Six Traits Writing rubric</li> <li>• Observed classrooms using SBRR effectively to get to know process and move toward own implementation</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,027 K-3 students assessed to determine reading strengths and needs</li> <li>• 214 K-3 students received program review to improve reading proficiency</li> <li>• 187 K-3 students received Tier 2 instruction to improve literacy proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 97% of all K students proficient in letter naming and 92% proficient in phoneme segmentation as measured by DIBELS</li> <li>• Percentage of students achieving benchmark in grades 1-3 improved by 20% as measured by DRA</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of students in K will reach proficiency as measured by DIBELS</li> <li>• 80% of students in grades 1-3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by the DRA</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
BOX ELDER SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8 literacy coaches</li> <li>• Kindergarten class size reduction (2 FTE)</li> <li>• 1 full-day kindergarten</li> <li>• Summer intervention program</li> <li>• Assessment</li> <li>• Professional development in district literacy model, teacher collaboration, guided reading, use of DIBELS assessment</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <p>Trained in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive literacy model</li> <li>• Guided reading</li> <li>• Analyzing data</li> <li>• Facilitating professional development</li> <li>• Making course corrections</li> <li>• Working cooperatively</li> <li>• Reading interventions</li> <li>• SBRR</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in comprehensive literacy model and guided reading</li> <li>• Participated in collaborative groups twice a month</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in comprehensive literacy model and guided reading</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Over 2,500 parents received training at school Parent Literacy Nights</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading instruction will be differentiated for every elementary student</li> <li>• Every student will be assessed with DIBELS at least 3 times during the school year</li> <li>• Targeted interventions will be used to instruct students identified as below benchmark on the DIBELS test</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-3 DIBELS scores will show improvement in the number of students scoring at benchmark</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of K students will score at benchmark in DIBELS letter naming and phoneme segmentation by 2007</li> <li>• The number of students in grades 1-3 scoring proficient on Utah Language Arts CRT will increase by 2% per year for the next 3 years</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
CACHE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 literacy facilitators hired to serve in elementary schools</li> <li>• 3 paraprofessionals hired to assist reading teachers with small group instruction at kindergarten (2 aides) and grade 3 (1 aide)</li> <li>• Intervention materials purchased for kindergarten and grade 3 students</li> <li>• Vocabulary intervention and assessment materials purchased for K-3 classrooms; aide time afforded for administration</li> <li>• Extended learning time (initiated by individual schools)</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Facilitators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received more than 100 hours of professional development in: teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension; administering and interpreting diagnostic assessments (DIBELS, DRA); effective coaching practices for assisting teachers with differentiated instruction</li> <li>• Managed the collection, dissemination, and analysis of DIBELS benchmark assessments, administered 3 times per year</li> <li>• Assisted in administering and analyzing DIBELS progress monitoring and other ongoing assessments to guide Tier 2 instruction</li> <li>• Provided ongoing training to paraprofessionals</li> <li>• Assisted teachers in designing and implementing Tier 2 instruction for struggling readers</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 265 K students received 30 minutes of daily intensive Tier 2 intervention</li> <li>• 310 Grade 3 students received 30-45 minutes of daily intensive Tier 2 intervention</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 86% of kindergarten students proficient on DIBELS phoneme segmentation</li> <li>• 84% of grade 1 students proficient on DIBELS oral reading</li> <li>• 79% of grade 2 students proficient on DIBELS oral reading</li> <li>• 69% of grade 3 students proficient on DIBELS oral reading</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of kindergarten students will achieve proficiency on DIBELS phoneme segmentation</li> <li>• 90% of students in grades 1-3 will achieve proficiency on Utah Language Arts CRT</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
CARBON SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2.5 reading specialists hired for most at-risk elementary schools</li> <li>• Professional development for literacy coaches and teachers</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in essential practices for successful literacy coaching</li> <li>• Trained to use and interpret DIBELS assessments</li> <li>• Reviewed student assessment data with teachers to plan interventions</li> <li>• Observed classroom instruction and worked with teachers to improve their instructional practice</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met with coaches to plan interventions for struggling readers</li> <li>• Informed on a weekly basis how students are performing</li> <li>• Used data to design instruction to meet student needs</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Informed of their student's progress on an ongoing basis</li> <li>• Regularly provided with midterm reports, standards-based report cards, and parent newsletters</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-3 teachers regularly assessed students using DIBELS and/or optional QRI</li> <li>• Gain scores for each student collected following each benchmark assessment</li> <li>• Reading interventions provided in phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension</li> <li>• Goal: Each K-3 student will make continuous improvement in reading proficiency and will be measured by an increase in the level of difficulty of materials read with confidence and comprehension; all students will meet or exceed on year's growth</li> <li>• Goal: All elementary schools will show a decrease in the numbers of students performing below proficiency levels</li> <li>• Subsequent years of implementation will build and expand on the above focus areas</li> </ul>
DAGGETT SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-time reading specialist hired at Manila Elementary School</li> <li>• USOE literacy coach training provided for reading specialist</li> <li>• 2 paraprofessionals hired to assist reading teachers</li> <li>• Reading intervention support materials purchased</li> <li>• DIBELS professional development provided for teachers and reading aides</li> <li>• After-school and summer reading programs provided</li> <li>• I Can Read tutoring program provided</li> <li>• Leveled libraries purchased (classroom sets of novels)</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Observed classroom instruction and worked cooperatively with teachers to assure best practice techniques are utilized</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS</li> <li>• Monitored students' reading progress (via time provided by substitutes)</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 72 students (100%) received DIBELS assessment and progress monitoring to improve reading proficiency</li> <li>• 28 students (39%) received Tier 2 intervention with reading specialist</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals were met at K, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6; with 100% of students in grades 3 and 4 meeting their goal</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See Section 3 for Utah Language Arts CRT results</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
DAVIS SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 additional reading teachers hired</li> <li>• Professional development for teachers (on phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension) and reading specialists</li> <li>• Integrated Learning System (ILS) purchased for individualized student practice</li> <li>• Stanford Diagnostic Reading Test (SDRT) purchased</li> <li>• K-3 intervention materials purchased</li> <li>• Time provided for 9 reading specialists to pilot a coaching program in schools</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received training on essential practices for coaching, instructional practices, and reading interventions</li> <li>• Worked closely with teachers</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in instructional practices, effective use of materials, and interventions (such as multi-sensory techniques for low-performing students)</li> <li>• Received training from nationally recognized experts in research (Jan Dole); comprehension (Mary Ellen Vogt); fluency and comprehension (Jack Pikulski); vocabulary and spelling (Shane Templeton)</li> <li>• Attended workshops on ILS to ensure appropriate implementation and effective use of data</li> <li>• Attended endorsement classes through NUCC, WSU, University of Utah</li> <li>• Assessed low-performing students and provided instruction in concepts of print, phonemic awareness, letter identification, word knowledge, and comprehension</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessed in January to provide mid-year benchmark</li> </ul> <p><b>Administrators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in instructional practices and reading interventions</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased literacy knowledge within buildings</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improved instructional procedures</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain or improve student performance</li> </ul>



SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
DUCHESNE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District literacy coordinator and 5 reading coaches hired to support literacy efforts in 6 schools</li> <li>• Travel time and supplies provided for coaches and teachers to receive professional development and collaborate</li> <li>• Districtwide progress monitoring procedures established to ensure that instructional resources match the educational needs of all students</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on Utah Core Curriculum as well as essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Received training in administering and interpreting DIBELS and SBRR interventions</li> <li>• Met with literacy coordinator bi-monthly to support and inform coaching</li> <li>• Met with teachers and literacy coordinator and/or principal to analyze assessment plan and implement tiered instruction and interventions</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received training in administering and implementing DIBELS and SBRR interventions</li> <li>• Established and sustained progress monitoring for at-risk students using DIBELS</li> <li>• Reviewed assessment data for every student at least 3 times per year to inform instruction</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 coaches, 66 teachers, 18 paraprofessionals proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Student assessment data monitored and analyzed at least 3 times per year in order to target instruction for all learners</li> <li>• 152 kindergarten students, 132 grade 1 students, 127 grade 2 students, 117 grade 3 students received assessment reviews</li> <li>• 60 kindergarten students, 51 grade 1 students, 46 grade 2 students, 64 grade 3 students received Tier 2 or 3 intervention</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collaborate with special education to deliver effective reading instruction</li> <li>• Address the following professional development topics: Utah Literacy Framework, fidelity to Utah Core Curriculum and basal program instruction</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of all students will read at or above grade level, as measured by DIBELS phoneme segmentation at K and by the Utah Language Arts CRT at grades 1-3</li> </ul>

**SCHOOL DISTRICTS<sup>12</sup>****EMERY COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT**

<b>Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2.5 reading teachers hired to work in 3 Title I schools</li><li>• DIBELS, DRA, DRP, CLIP reading assessment materials purchased</li><li>• Professional development provided for Reading First, Leveled Reading, Collaborative Literacy Intervention Program (CLIP), I Can Read intervention, Reading Endorsement Program, Summer Reading Institute</li><li>• Professional development provided in administering and interpreting DIBELS, DRA, DRP, EduTest assessments</li></ul>
<b>Activities/ Program Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• District provided funding and support for EduTest (Lightspan) assessment tools for ongoing reading assessment</li><li>• District adopted and implemented new elementary basal reading program</li><li>• District established Reading/Literacy Committee, with representation from all elementary schools, to evaluate programs and research best practices</li><li>• Peer and Cross-Age Tutoring programs implemented at each elementary school</li></ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Trained in Reading First, Leveled Reading, I Can Read, CLIP interventions; DRA, DRP, DIBELS, EduTest, Running Records assessments; Utah's Six-Trait Writing framework; curriculum strategies related to district's newly adopted reading program</li><li>• 12 participating in Southern Utah University's two-year reading endorsement and masters degree program</li><li>• Reviewed data and collaborated for instructional improvement in grade-level meetings</li><li>• Participated in USOE summer reading institutes</li></ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2 attended Principals' Literacy Academy (4 others have already participated)</li></ul>
<b>Program Outcomes</b>	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 321 students assessed three times using EduTest assessment for reading proficiency</li><li>• 135 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve reading proficiency, including Title I, CLIP, and extended day K</li></ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See Section 3 for Utah Language Arts CRT results</li></ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• An overall increase in the percentage of students reading at or above grade level by the end of grade 3, beginning with 1st grade of 2004-05</li></ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
GARFIELD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 reading coaches hired to work in 3 largest elementary schools</li> <li>• Professional development provided for coaches on USOE essential practices for school literacy coaching, administering and interpreting DIBELS, newly adopted district basal reading program</li> <li>• Professional development provided for teachers on phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing; administering and interpreting DIBELS; using newly adopted basal reading program; providing reading interventions</li> <li>• Classroom materials and training supplies</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in USOE essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Trained to use data to provide intervention and organize professional development</li> <li>• Trained on newly adopted basal reading program</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Trained on newly adopted basal reading program</li> <li>• Representative from each elementary school received literacy training from the Rural Schools Academy</li> <li>• Trained in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension, writing</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District hired 3 reading coaches; adopted new basal reading program; implemented districtwide reading plan</li> <li>• All teachers trained to administer and interpret DIBELS</li> <li>• Teachers beginning to collect and use data for interventions, progress monitoring, program development</li> <li>• All elementary students in the district received instruction improvement with a new, districtwide reading program</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District Language Arts CRT scores increased</li> <li>• Three DIBELS benchmark tests were administered; new database is available to teachers and instructional improvement plans have been crafted from data</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation programs and Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction will be strengthened</li> <li>• DIBELS used as a proficiency measurement tool to collect data and improve instruction</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
GRAND COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 FTE kindergarten positions</li> <li>• Reading specialist hired part-time</li> <li>• 3 half-time reading assistants hired to support kindergarten interventions</li> <li>• Family services liaisons</li> <li>• Summer school provided</li> <li>• Professional development provided</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worked with ELL students struggling with reading and language-related skills</li> <li>• Collaborated with classroom teachers regarding intervention strategies for this population</li> <li>• Facilitated professional development in the area of Sheltered Instruction</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitored student progress through diagnostic and outcome assessments; students with persistent learning difficulties assessed more frequently and in-depth</li> <li>• Used data to guide intervention efforts</li> <li>• Trained in Reading First and Reciprocal Teaching literacy models</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received student performance data; reported to Superintendent and School Board</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided with individual and group assessment reports</li> <li>• Trained in interactive literacy activities by family services liaisons</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-day kindergarten and summer school established</li> <li>• Gain scores for each student were collected following each benchmark assessment</li> <li>• Professional development/literacy training provided to teachers and parents</li> <li>• Sought increases in percentages of students reading at or above grade level (see Section 3 for assessment results)</li> </ul>
GRANITE SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading specialists hired</li> <li>• Early/Next Steps intervention specialists hired</li> <li>• Great Beginnings teacher mentoring program provided</li> <li>• Yearly Progress Pro online benchmarking tool developed and implemented</li> <li>• Elementary attendance trackers implemented</li> <li>• Jump on English, Reading Recovery interventions purchased</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Beginnings teacher mentoring program</li> <li>• Teacher and administrator observation and coaching program using district literacy framework</li> <li>• Yearly Progress Pro: Computerized program that assists teachers with weekly assessment to guide concept mastery</li> <li>• Jump Start on Reading: Summer program for ELL students to increase literacy achievement</li> <li>• Elementary Attendance Trackers: Paraprofessional trackers identify students with attendance problems and use a procedure to reduce truancy</li> <li>• Early Steps/Next Steps Intervention: 1-on-1 reading program for struggling readers; intervention delivered by teachers or paraprofessionals</li> <li>• Reading Specialists: 61 elementary schools have grade 1 reading specialist that works with most at-risk students using district literacy plan</li> <li>• DRA benchmark assessment is used 3 times per year</li> <li>• Reading Recovery Observation Survey given at least 3 times per year at grade 1</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-3 students will show measurable gain in reading performance (see Section 3 for assessment results)</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
IRON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 reading specialists hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for reading specialists in USOE essential practices for school literacy coaching; phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension; International Reading Conference visit; University of Utah Early Steps/Next Steps; Southern Utah University cohort training</li> <li>• Professional development provided for teachers in guided reading and district literacy strategy</li> <li>• Leveled libraries purchased for two elementary schools</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in USOE essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS and making data-based decisions</li> <li>• Made site visits in Logan to observe other coaches/specialists</li> <li>• Trained at International Reading Conference in Texas, University of Utah Early Steps/Next Steps, Southern Utah University cohort training</li> <li>• Working toward SUU reading endorsement</li> <li>• Observed instruction and helped teachers implement research-based instructional strategies</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early Wednesday dismissal provides time for staff training in guided reading, research-based instructional strategies, interventions, collaboration, planning</li> <li>• 50 teachers working toward SUU reading endorsement</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 558 students who were at risk due to low reading scores received intervention</li> <li>• 724 students received Tier 2 interventions to help them obtain grade-level proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District has between 51% (grade 3) and 62% (kindergarten) of students at grade level as measured by DIBELS; will improve each grade by 5% per year</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
JORDAN SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 56 school literacy specialists hired</li> <li>• Professional development delivered to teachers by Curriculum and Staff Development staff and Curriculum Development executive director</li> <li>• Online formative assessment and DIBELS materials purchased</li> <li>• New kindergarten end-of-level assessment developed, produced, and piloted</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Specialists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivered ongoing literacy professional development to teachers</li> <li>• Trained teachers during monthly full-day research-based reading and best practices literacy training as well as after-school CONNECT training</li> <li>• Mentored teachers and supported Balanced Literacy implementation across all grades</li> <li>• Provided individual and small group reading intervention for struggling K-3 readers</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed and piloted 6 different end-of-level kindergarten assessments</li> <li>• Provided with ongoing, on-site, literacy professional development</li> <li>• Received on-site Balanced Literacy implementation support</li> <li>• Provided with access to test materials and accompanying data services at the beginning of SY2005-06</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Struggling readers received reading interventions due to added staff (literacy specialist)</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in literacy and instructional leadership by Curriculum Development executive director (14 hours)</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased literacy education knowledge and skills among 56 elementary literacy specialists</li> <li>• Increased teacher and principal knowledge and understanding of best practices and Balanced Literacy process and skills</li> <li>• Increased frequency and quality of reading interventions</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% reading proficiency at grades K-3</li> <li>• Schoolwide K-6 Balanced Literacy implementation</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% reading proficiency K-6</li> <li>• Districtwide K-6 Balanced Literacy implementation</li> </ul>



SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
JUAB SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 K teachers hired to provide after-school tutoring</li> <li>• Time provided for teachers to review student data and plan remediation</li> <li>• In-service provided to 3 teachers at each grade level K-3 to develop grade-level Language Arts plans and strategies</li> <li>• 6-week summer school provided to students reading below grade level</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2-3 extended day sessions provided per week for 52 students below grade level</li> <li>• Utilized DRA and DIBELS assessments districtwide to monitor student progress</li> <li>• Reviewed data weekly in grade-level teams; at-risk students identified and referred to small-group, extended-day, or summer-school programs</li> <li>• Used Reading First instructional techniques (taken directly from National Reading Panel's literacy research findings)</li> <li>• Created and utilized curriculum map</li> <li>• Created and analyzed spreadsheets showing K-3 student reading levels and writing proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contacted weekly (at K) and bi-monthly (after/summer-school students) regarding student progress; collaborated on ways to reinforce concepts at home</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extended-day kindergarten implemented</li> <li>• After-school program initiated for grades 1-3</li> <li>• Intensive six-week summer school established</li> <li>• 52 students received Tier 2 reading instruction</li> <li>• All K-3 student progress monitored</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85% of all K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS (see Section 3 for assessment results)</li> </ul>
KANE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 district reading specialist hired</li> <li>• 1 reading coach hired</li> <li>• 4 reading aides hired</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>District Specialist &amp; Reading Coach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained teachers to monitor progress and identify struggling readers</li> <li>• Worked with teachers to analyze assessments in order to plan and prioritize reading instruction and implement intervention strategies</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in the delivery of effective reading instruction, including the use of early intervention strategies, classroom materials, and remedial programs</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous improvement in proficiency as measured by an increase in the level of difficulty where students can read with confidence and comprehension from beginning to midyear to end of year</li> <li>• Increases at each school and grade level in the percentages of students reading at or above grade level as measured by standardized tests</li> <li>• Ongoing progress during bi-monthly progress monitor tracking following instructional focus toward student's specific needs</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
LOGAN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 literacy coaches hired</li> <li>• 12 full-time kindergarten paraprofessionals hired and trained to assist in providing Tier 2 instruction</li> <li>• Professional development provided to teachers in guided reading and working with literacy coaches</li> <li>• Tier 2 SBRR interventions (Early Success, Soar to Success) purchased</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to observe Tier 1 instruction and implement SBRR practices using Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have access to Early Success or Soar to Success intervention groups</li> <li>• Attended eight-week guided reading course</li> <li>• Reviewed assessment data with school literacy coaches and planned and implemented interventions to support struggling readers</li> </ul> <p><b>Kindergarten Paraprofessionals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to provide early reading intervention instruction as part of extended kindergarten day</li> <li>• Provided small-group Tier 2 instruction to at-risk students</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy coaches and reading aides proficient in providing targeted small group intervention (Early Success, Soar to Success)</li> <li>• Teachers trained to effectively implement guided reading</li> <li>• Literacy coaches and teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> <li>• 49% of kindergarten students received targeted intervention in small groups</li> <li>• 33% of grade 1 students, 40% of grade 2 students, 35% of grade 3 students received targeted intervention in small groups</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 99.8% of all K-3 students met benchmark or showed growth between DIBELS fall and spring assessments</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of all students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS (grades K-3) and Utah Language Arts CRT (grades 1-3)</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
MILLARD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 literacy coaches hired</li> <li>• 3 part-time intervention specialists hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for literacy coaches in USOE essential practices for successful school literacy coaching and SBRR practices</li> <li>• Professional development provided for teachers and reading aides in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• DIBELS testing materials, professional libraries, and literacy materials purchased</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Trained to observe Tier 1 instruction and successfully implement SBRR practices using the UT Language Arts Core Curriculum to prevent reading failure</li> <li>• Trained in Tier 2 model and successfully implemented individual and/or small group interventions to support Tier 1 instruction</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS; teams organized to assess K-3 students in February and May</li> <li>• Met regularly to review assessment data with literacy coaches; appropriate instruction and interventions planned and implemented to support struggling readers</li> </ul> <p><b>Intervention Specialists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy coaches, intervention specialists, teachers, and paraprofessionals proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Literacy coaches, intervention specialists, and teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers and monitor their progress</li> <li>• 785 students received DIBELS benchmark screening assessments in an effort to identify struggling readers</li> <li>• More than 75 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency, as well as progress monitoring</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CRT scores at grades 1-3 improved districtwide</li> <li>• Positive kindergarten growth was recorded from the first to the second administration of DIBELS letter naming and phoneme segmentation, even though proficiency was not met</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 65% of all K students will attain reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS</li> <li>• 77% of all grades 1-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by Utah Language Arts CRT</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
MORGAN COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 reading coach hired</li> <li>• Additional paraprofessionals hired</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delivered Tier 1 instruction in the regular classroom setting; any student below grade level at any time during the school year has an individual learning plan (ILP) developed and is provided additional, differentiated instruction and practice (Tier 2)</li> </ul> <p><b>Reading Specialist (and Paraprofessionals)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implemented reading intervention program to provide additional help and support (Tier 3) for struggling students</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kindergarten DIBELS: 8 to 25 correct initial sounds, 8 to 40 correct letters named</li> <li>• Grade 1 DIBELS: 35 correct phonemes segmented, 20 to 40 correct words per minute (oral reading)</li> <li>• Grade 2 DIBELS: 44 to 90 correct words per minute (oral reading)</li> <li>• Grade 3 DIBELS: 77 to 110 correct words per minute (oral reading)</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90-95% of all students (especially 3rd graders) will be at or above grade level at the end of the school year</li> <li>• As Morgan Elementary is a high-achieving school, efforts will go toward maintaining its high achievement level and working to make an overall gain by targeting our lowest achieving students</li> </ul>
MURRAY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3.5 reading coordinators hired</li> <li>• Paraprofessionals hired to provide direct reading interventions to students below proficiency in reading</li> <li>• Professional development provided to reading coordinators on administering and interpreting DIBELS, DRA, QRI assessments; as well as Arkansas Literacy Model, Early Steps intervention, cognitive coaching</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Coordinators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in Arkansas Literacy Model, Early Steps intervention, and cognitive coaching</li> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS, DRA, QRI assessments</li> <li>• Trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS, DRA, QRI assessments</li> <li>• Trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> <li>• Administered an individual reading assessment to each student at beginning of school year</li> <li>• Identified non-proficient students, developed ILPs, and planned and implemented differentiated instruction and interventions</li> <li>• Reviewed student progress on ILPs</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All K-3 students were administered a diagnostic reading assessment to determine proficiency</li> <li>• 320 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on data from ILP meetings, majority of students receiving reading interventions have made significant proficiency gains</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 85% of all students who leave grade 3 will be proficient readers</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
NEBO SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7 literacy specialists hired</li> <li>• Additional summer tutors and Reading Recovery teachers hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for literacy specialists (on coaching, Tier 2 interventions) and teachers (on Reading Recovery, summer tutoring, Tier 2 interventions)</li> <li>• Transitional Grade 1 program started at 5 schools</li> <li>• Summer tutoring program implemented</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Specialists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coached teachers, demonstrated lessons, worked as school intervention specialist (helping teachers/principal review assessment and provide appropriate Tier 2 interventions)</li> <li>• Provided professional development, specific to the needs at each grade level, to teachers at collaboration meetings (at least once per month)</li> </ul> <p><b>Summer Tutoring</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94 identified students participated in Grade 2 tutoring program</li> <li>• Provided professional development to teachers to help them learn the structure of the tutoring process: instructing, assessing, reporting</li> <li>• 23 teachers provided differentiated tutoring, monitoring and reporting progress, enabling students to make expected progress, and preventing loss of reading skills during summer</li> </ul> <p><b>Reading Recovery (RR)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 RR teacher spent year at St. Mary's College becoming RR leader/trainer</li> <li>• 4 RR teachers hired to provide Tier 2 intervention at grade 1</li> <li>• 6 RR teachers received professional development to enable them to better meet student needs</li> <li>• RR teachers provided instruction for 80 students reading below grade level</li> </ul> <p><b>Transitional Grade 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 schools tried different intervention model for lowest 10% of grade 1 students; classes had 9-12 students</li> <li>• Teachers provided explicit instruction and monitored student progress (reported at team meetings)</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students received focused initial literacy instruction</li> <li>• Approximately 600 students received Tier 2 intervention (I Can Read)</li> <li>• 54 grade 1 students participated in Transitional Grade 1/alternate classroom placement</li> <li>• 53 grade 1 students received Tier 2 intervention (Reading Recovery)</li> <li>• 94 grade 2 students received summer tutoring</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmark scores in grades 1-3 improved at midyear and end of year</li> <li>• 83.5% of grade 1 students, 80% of grade 2 students, 76.6% of grade 3 students performed at grade level on district benchmark assessment and DRA</li> <li>• 107 grade 1 non-readers made progress in Transition Grade 1 or Reading Recovery (more than 60% read at grade level on district benchmark assessment and DRA)</li> <li>• 40% of below-level grade 3 students made more than a year's growth via summer tutoring, according to district benchmark assessment</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% of all students in grades 1-3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by the Utah Language Arts CRT</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
NORTH SANPETE SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 literacy coach hired</li> <li>• Half salary of 1 full-day kindergarten teacher at a high ELL school</li> <li>• Professional development provided to teachers and coaches on phonemic awareness, classroom management, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, as well as on administering and interpreting DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> <li>• Teacher materials, leveled and take-home libraries, and media centers purchased</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coach</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in classroom management, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension</li> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> <li>• Reviewed data at least monthly to determine areas of need</li> <li>• Planned and implemented reading interventions</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in classroom management, phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension</li> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> <li>• Reviewed data at least monthly to determine areas of need</li> <li>• Planned and implemented reading interventions</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 700 students received improved reading instruction; individual attention regarding lit proficiency; appropriate Tier 2 and 3 interventions</li> <li>• Classrooms, libraries, media centers contain thousands of new books and print materials; students have access to more reading material on their reading level and in their areas of interest</li> <li>• 2 coaches and 40 teachers are proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS and TPRI assessments and on using data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> <li>• 2 coaches and 40 teachers have greater knowledge of instruction around phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension; also able to better organize and manage classrooms to provide better environment for teaching and learning</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of all kindergarten students met benchmark standards on DIBELS phoneme segmentation</li> <li>• Utah Language Arts CRT scores expected to improve at grades 1-3</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of kindergarten students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS</li> <li>• 77% of students in grades 1-3 will reach proficiency as measured by Utah Language Arts CRT by 2007</li> </ul>



SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
NORTH SUMMIT SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3/4 time reading specialist hired</li> <li>• AmeriCorps personnel</li> <li>• DIBELS implementation</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in DIBELS and Reading First</li> <li>• Delivered interventions via small group instruction to struggling readers</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Monitored student progress throughout year via formative assessments</li> <li>• Implemented ILPs</li> </ul> <p><b>Principal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed Principal's Literacy Academy</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attended summer program to increase and maintain skills</li> <li>• Offered preschool and extended-day K</li> </ul> <p><b>AmeriCorps Personnel</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided one-on-one tutoring</li> <li>• Provided after-school program</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students tested using DIBELS in Fall, Winter, and Spring</li> <li>• All students not meeting DIBELS benchmark were progress-monitored weekly or bi-weekly</li> <li>• 95 students received intervention services</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 82% met May DIBELS benchmark at K</li> <li>• Students' targeted benchmarks increased from September to May at grades 1-3</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of all K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS at K and Utah CRT and DIBELS at grades 1-3 (see Section 3 for assessment results)</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
OGDEN CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paid salary of 1 reading coach</li> <li>• Paid 1/4 of the salary of 8 AmeriCorps tutors</li> <li>• Paid for 32 hours of professional development for all K-3 teachers</li> <li>• Upgraded every school to a scientifically based core reading program</li> <li>• Provided a full library of informational text for every K-3 classroom</li> <li>• Printed DIBELS assessment materials</li> <li>• Provided upgrades in classroom environment for all K-3 teachers</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Met weekly for training and collaboration</li> <li>• Assisted and supervised reading instruction</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in classroom environment, explicit instruction, fluency, use of informational text</li> <li>• Classrooms better organized for learning</li> <li>• Administered benchmark assessments three times per year to measure and monitor student progress</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received more direct instruction focused on specific targeted learning outcomes (phonemic awareness, etc.)</li> <li>• Received instruction from best available materials</li> <li>• Have access to hundreds of informational texts to build background knowledge and to learn to read to gain information</li> <li>• Tutored one-on-one for thousands of hours by AmeriCorps volunteers</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assisted and supervised reading instruction</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classrooms are better equipped and better organized for high-quality instruction</li> <li>• Teachers' knowledge base is much greater on targeted outcomes</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expectations and standards are now in place for the future, including specific follow up in SY2005-06</li> <li>• 75% of the grades in district schools (68 of 90) have more students at benchmark than they did a year ago</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 71% of all students in grades 1-3 will be proficient on UT Language Arts CRT</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
PARK CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading paraprofessionals hired at all elementary schools based on numbers of individualized learning plans</li> <li>• Provided four-week, half-day summer school for at-risk students in grades K-4</li> <li>• Provided parent trainings for parents of ELL students</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Paraprofessionals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided reading instruction for Tier 2 students with indicated interventions from ILP meetings</li> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS and manage progress monitoring</li> </ul> <p><b>Summer School Program</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinator and teachers now being hired</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250 K-3 students were assigned to a SBRR program to improve their reading scores</li> <li>• Intensive reading program planned for over 100 at-risk students</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 Hispanic families attended six monthly Family Literacy Nights</li> <li>• Four-session beginning computer class provided in Spanish</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided a focused summer reading program for at-risk students</li> <li>• Involved more Hispanic families in schools</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Greater involvement by Hispanic families with their children in order to increase student learning</li> <li>• See Section 3 for student gains on Utah Language Arts CRT</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease the number of subgroups and students scoring non-proficient in reading on Utah Language Arts CRT</li> <li>• Increase the percentage of students reaching benchmark to 80% as measured by DIBELS</li> </ul>
PIUTE SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hired 2 additional part-time reading teachers, one for each Title I elementary school</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS</li> <li>• Trained in Wilson Reading</li> <li>• Teacher leaders trained in tiered instruction</li> <li>• Reviewed assessment data</li> <li>• Planned and implemented appropriate instructional practices and interventions to support the needs of struggling readers</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 75% of students in grades 1-3 reading proficiently (as measured by CRT) at the end of the third school year (see Section 3 for first-year assessment results)</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of students in grades 1-3 reading proficiently (as measured by CRT) at the end of the third school year</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>1,2</sup>	
PROVO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools provided with paraprofessional hours for K-3 reading interventions</li> <li>Professional development provided for literacy coordinators, teachers, and paraprofessionals on tutoring and literacy strategies</li> <li>Elementary literacy materials purchased (One-to-One Tutoring, Project SEEL, principal materials)</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coordinators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trained in USOE effective literacy coaching strategies</li> <li>Trained in reading strategies in monthly professional development meetings</li> <li>Provided in-service training and led discussions with classroom teachers related to literacy instruction in monthly guided meetings</li> <li>Mentored teachers in their classrooms</li> <li>Identified and purchased materials to support improved classroom instruction and tutoring</li> </ul> <p><b>Paraprofessionals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trained to provide reading interventions</li> <li>Trained in the use of One-to-One Tutoring and Project SEEL</li> <li>Provided individual and small group literacy tutoring to at-risk students</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used assessments to identify students in need of literacy tutoring</li> <li>Participated in regular professional development directed to improve student literacy</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identified and purchased materials to support improved classroom instruction and tutoring</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Over 700 students participated in reading interventions across the district</li> <li>Majority of students participating in reading interventions made significant growth in reading ability based on individual school-level assessments</li> <li>District K assessment is being analyzed to determine appropriate cut scores for proficiency and gain measurements</li> <li>Teachers' instructional practice in language arts is changing</li> <li>Teachers' attentiveness to their students' reading assessments increased</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Percentage gain on kindergarten assessment remained stable despite increasing numbers of at-risk students; gains are anticipated as kindergarten interventions expand</li> <li>2% increase in the percentage of students achieving reading proficiency on Utah Language Arts CRT is anticipated at grades 1-3 based on reading gains measured for individual students at the school level (see Section 3 for actual gains)</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gain experienced by kindergarten students from beginning to end of school year (as measured by K assessment) will increase yearly</li> <li>By 2007, 85% of students in grades 1-3 will reach reading proficiency as measured by Utah Language Arts CRT</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
RICH SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding provided access to Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) monitoring to help teachers track student progress</li> <li>• Intervention program purchased to provide controlled reading material for struggling readers</li> <li>• Books purchased to supplement basal reading program activities</li> <li>• Teacher resource books purchased for every elementary teacher to strengthen instructional techniques</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<u>Teachers</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received training from well-known reading specialist</li> <li>• Attended professional development workshops throughout the year to enhance teaching practices</li> <li>• Attended conferences to bring new reading and writing ideas into classrooms</li> <li>• Developed assessments to use as baselines; set student groups; administered reading interventions</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><u>SHORT TERM</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students tested to determine reading levels and improve proficiency</li> <li>• Students below grade level given extra reading help to develop skills and strategies they can use to become more proficient readers</li> </ul> <p><u>MEDIUM TERM</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students in grades 1-3 performed higher on assessments in spring than in fall</li> <li>• 95% of kindergarten students met proficiency on letter naming fluency and sounds as measured by CBM</li> </ul> <p><u>LONG TERM</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of all K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by CBM, STAR testing, and Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum standards</li> </ul>

## SCHOOL DISTRICTS<sup>12</sup>

### SALT LAKE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 literacy coaches hired</li> <li>• Cross-Age Tutoring provided and 1 Cross-Age Tutor trainer hired</li> <li>• 1 assistant to the Coordinator of Language Arts hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for kindergarten and grade 3 teachers in such areas as phonics, writing, oral language, comprehension, and fluency</li> <li>• 3 FTEs used to fund 6 Reading Recovery teachers</li> <li>• 15 teachers trained in Early Steps</li> <li>• Full-day kindergarten provided at 21 sites</li> <li>• DIBELS and DRA assessment materials and training provided</li> <li>• Teacher materials/professional texts purchased to support Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum instruction</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participated bi-monthly in their own systemic professional development relevant to adult learning, Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum, reading interventions, the assessment-instruction cycle</li> <li>• Facilitated collaborative coaching cycles, grade and cross-grade discussions, district professional development days with kindergarten and grade 3 teachers, site data analysis, and selecting students for targeted intervention</li> <li>• Supported implementation of DIBELS, DRA, SLCS K assessment</li> </ul> <p><b>Assistant to Coordinator of Language Arts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitated implementation of Early Steps</li> <li>• Trained teachers to administer and interpret DIBELS</li> </ul> <p><b>Cross-Age Tutoring</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trainer taught students in grades 4-6 to support literacy growth of students in grades 1-3</li> <li>• 4 schools fully implemented Cross-Age Tutoring; 3 additional sites began doing so</li> <li>• 751 students in grades 4-6 received training and support sessions</li> <li>• 833 students in grades 1-3 tutored in reading strategies</li> </ul> <p><b>Reading Recovery (RR)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 RR teachers trained</li> <li>• 56 students receive RR tutoring</li> </ul> <p><b>Early Steps</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 teachers and 2 literacy coaches trained</li> <li>• 18 students received 85 tutor sessions</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kindergarten and grade 3 teachers took part in professional development focusing on Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum; observed appropriate instructional practice; engaged in cross-school professional discussions emphasizing oral language instruction and assessment, literacy and writing skills, small group instruction, and student performance expectations</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased oral language acquisition of targeted kindergarten students assessed and instructed in oral language</li> <li>• 64% of full-day kindergarten students read at end-of-year benchmark level (DRA text level 3 or above); 13% were approaching benchmark (DRA text level 2)</li> <li>• Increased fluency rates and comprehension of targeted grade 3 students</li> <li>• Increased number of classrooms implementing systematic phonics and spelling instruction</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate an increase in the percentage of students making or exceeding one year's growth when comparing yearly CRT scores</li> <li>• Demonstrate increased proficiency among targeted Tier 2 students</li> <li>• Demonstrate increase in the percentage of students reading on grade level as measured by DRA</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the percentage of students in grades 1-3 reading on grade level as demonstrated on Utah Language Arts CRT</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
SAN JUAN SCHOOL DISTRICT	
<b>Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 literacy intervention supervisors hired</li> <li>• 7 part-time small group literacy instructors hired</li> <li>• Books and materials; consumables for Family Literacy Bags purchased</li> </ul>
<b>Activities/ Program Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gain scores for each student are collected following each benchmark and progress monitoring assessment (administered on a regular basis throughout school year)</li> <li>• Assessment data analyzed on a regular basis and used to make instructional decisions for all K-3 students identified as reading below level</li> <li>• Literacy supervisors collaborate with teachers to effectively use formative assessment data to design instruction and plan interventions</li> <li>• Three-hour uninterrupted literacy block provided daily</li> <li>• District staff provided with a variety of professional development opportunities (assessment, classroom management, small group instruction, tutoring, etc.)</li> <li>• Parents provided with Family Literacy Bags</li> </ul>
<b>Program Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continuous improvement in proficiency as measured by an increase in the level of difficulty where students can read with confidence and comprehension from beginning to midyear to end of year</li> <li>• Increase in each school and grade level in the percentages of students reading on or above grade level as measured by standardized tests</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
SEVIER SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 literacy coaches hired for 3 Title I schools</li> <li>• Professional development provided for literacy coaches, intervention specialists, and principals</li> <li>• Level I reading endorsement classes provided for 57 teachers</li> <li>• Leveled libraries purchased to support reading interventions</li> <li>• School-based intervention program provided before and after school and during summer</li> <li>• Improved Sevier School District's Parent (Web) Page</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Trained to use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> <li>• Trained to observe literacy instruction and work cooperatively with teachers to improve Purpose, Engagement, Rigor, Results (PERR)</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> <li>• Reviewed assessment data monthly with principals, literacy coaches, intervention specialists</li> <li>• Planned and implemented appropriate instruction and interventions to support struggling readers</li> <li>• Follow-up training was provided to help teachers implement Tier 1 instruction using SBRR practices and Utah Language Arts Core Curriculum to prevent reading failure</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to observe literacy instruction and work cooperatively with teachers to improve Purpose, Engagement, Rigor, Results (PERR)</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to access parent (web) page and interpret child's literacy scores</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,320 students' ongoing diagnostic reading data were reviewed and individualized learning plans were developed based on need</li> <li>• 163 students received from 30-105 minutes for up to 170 days per year of Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All kindergarten students had improved results on January to April progress monitoring assessments in all TPRI subtests</li> <li>• All students in grades 1-3 had improved results on September to April progress monitoring assessments in all TPRI subtests</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of Grade 3 students reached reading proficiency as measured by the Utah Language Arts CRT</li> <li>• 2 of 5 elementary schools in district achieved 90% reading goal this year</li> </ul>



SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
SOUTH SANPETE SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 literacy coaches hired</li> <li>• Professional development for literacy coaches on DIBELS, TPRI assessments</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received training through CUES Regional Reading Specialist</li> <li>• Held grade-level study groups</li> <li>• Administered and interpreted DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Held grade-level study groups</li> <li>• Administered and interpreted DIBELS and TPRI assessments</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 808 students received DIBELS testing to determine reading proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of all students will achieve benchmark level on DIBELS</li> </ul>
SOUTH SUMMIT SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 full-time reading specialist hired</li> <li>• 3 additional reading teachers hired</li> <li>• 3 AmeriCorps volunteers hired</li> <li>• 1 paraprofessional hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for reading specialist</li> <li>• Literacy supplies and guided reading libraries purchased</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 AmeriCorps volunteers and 1 paraprofessional ran a summer and before-school lit program</li> <li>• Average class size in grades K-2 was decreased by approximately 5 students per class</li> <li>• Well-known reading experts provided in-service on reading fluency to all staff</li> <li>• 30 teachers and 8 paraprofessionals proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Schoolwide-leveled guided reading library stocked and used by everyone during daily hour-long guided reading intervention time</li> <li>• Reading specialist provided training for all teachers and paraprofessionals on DIBELS and Tier 1 reading instruction</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 600 students received Balanced Literacy program daily</li> <li>• 60 students received Tier 2 interventions with reading specialist daily</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of students in grades 1-3 have DIBELS scores that reflect adequate yearly growth</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of all K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
TINTIC SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 reading specialist/literacy coach hired</li> <li>• DIBELS assessment materials purchased</li> <li>• Teachers provided with lessons and assessments from Core Teaching Reading Sourcebooks</li> <li>• Teachers provided with Words Their Way materials</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Reviewed student data with teachers</li> <li>• Used lessons from Core Teaching Reading Sourcebook to focus on low areas for Tier 1 and 2 instruction</li> <li>• Trained in Words Their Way</li> <li>• Trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in Words Their Way</li> <li>• Proficient in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement improved instruction for struggling readers</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 38 students received Tier 2 intervention to improve literacy proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All kindergarten students improved on state assessment and teacher-generated CRTs</li> <li>• All grade 1 students improved on QRI3 assessment</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100% of K-3 students will meet or exceed 1 year's growth on state kindergarten assessment or QRI3</li> <li>• 90% of students in grades 1-3 will be sufficient or above on Utah CRT</li> </ul>
TOOELE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 literacy specialists hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for literacy specialists, teachers, principals</li> <li>• New district basal reading program, professional literacy books purchased</li> <li>• Leveled libraries, guided reading and take-home libraries purchased</li> <li>• I Can Read, Cross-Age Tutoring programs provided</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Specialists</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Organized and managed book programs and Cross-Age Tutoring programs</li> <li>• Administered school-leveled reading libraries</li> <li>• Trained to administer and interpret DIBELS</li> <li>• Spent 50% of time working with small groups in Tier 2 or 3 instruction</li> <li>• Mentored new teachers</li> <li>• Applied research-based principles as they discuss literacy reference books in study groups, during mentoring, or while developing school literacy plans</li> <li>• Directed and assisted staff with curriculum mapping and such programs as Cross-Age Tutoring, I Can Read</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in Language Assistance for Teachers of English, Writing Workshop, Literacy in Depth, Words Their Way, Kindergarten Curriculum Mapping, Summer Reading Academy, Cooperative Learning</li> <li>• 22 K teachers trained to administer and interpret DIBELS</li> <li>• Worked with small groups in need of Tier 2 or 3 instruction</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 attended USOE Principals Literacy Academy</li> <li>• Used school data, testing, reading specialist's expertise to review test data and implement school literacy plans</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• District UPASS data continues to show improvement in reading achievement</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
UINTAH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy coordinators</li> <li>• Literacy training (CELL/ExLL) provided to teachers and coordinators</li> <li>• 6 half-time teachers hired to offer literacy coordinators time to observe and advise teachers</li> <li>• NWEA assessment materials</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy coordinators received 5 weeks of training throughout the school year</li> <li>• Literacy coordinators and teachers trained in CELL/ExLL literacy framework for classroom instruction and intervention</li> <li>• Classroom assessments utilized to monitor student progress and communicate with parents</li> <li>• Monthly parent meetings held throughout school year</li> <li>• School site visits organized to support teacher learning and model implementation</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve teaching, learning, and achievement for all students</li> <li>• Each year students demonstrate nine months of literacy growth as measured by Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) assessments or as stipulated by student's IEP</li> </ul>
WASATCH COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 district reading specialist hired</li> <li>• 3 literacy coordinators hired for elementary schools</li> <li>• Professional development provided for reading specialist (USOE training) for specialist and teachers (guided reading, leveled reading, DRA training)</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Reading Specialist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received USOE training on essential practices for successful school literacy coaching</li> <li>• Worked with teachers as mentors, modeling strategies and techniques through demonstration lessons</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained on guided reading strategies</li> <li>• Introduced leveled texts and observed, prompted, and evaluated student performance as they independently read</li> <li>• Reviewed assessment data in quarterly grade-level meetings and collaborated on appropriate instruction and interventions to support the needs of struggling readers</li> <li>• Trained to administer DRA and use it to guide instruction</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students who are not reading proficiently are in a program to improve proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade 3 CRT scores improved; 4.56% more students were proficient this year than last</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Percentage of non-proficient students, as measured by Utah CRT, will decrease yearly until district, state, and federal goals are met</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
WASHINGTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy coaches hired</li> <li>• Additional Reading Recovery (RR) teachers hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for literacy coaches and RR teachers</li> <li>• Funding provided for teachers to pursue Utah Level 1 Reading Endorsements</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Literacy Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attended PLC conferences</li> </ul> <p><b>Reading Recovery Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Worked with identified Grade 1 students</li> <li>• Trained monthly for entire year</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weekly collaboration time set aside at each school</li> <li>• Trained to administer guided reading</li> <li>• Hundreds have attended one or more of district's Level 1 Reading Endorsement classes</li> </ul> <p><b>District Programs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 schools implemented I Can Read</li> <li>• 10 schools using Side By Side tutors</li> <li>• 13 schools using Cross-Age Tutoring</li> <li>• 8 schools have Extended-Day K</li> <li>• 18 schools have family literacy program</li> <li>• 9 schools have after-school program</li> <li>• 11 schools have summer reading program</li> <li>• 4 schools have preschool</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students not proficient as measured by Utah CRT will be identified each year and interventions implemented</li> <li>• All students not proficient as measured by DRA will be identified each year and interventions implemented</li> <li>• All students not on grade level according to Words Their Way Spelling Inventory will be identified and interventions implemented</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Utah Language Arts CRT scores at grades 1-3 will improve each year</li> <li>• Midyear testing will show that 100% of identified at-risk readers are making progress</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 90% of students in grades will be proficient on Utah CRTs at the end of 3 years</li> <li>• There will be a 5% increase (or 90%) in the number of students reaching reading proficiency as measured by DRA</li> <li>• At least 90% of students in grades 1-3 will be near or on grade level by the end of the year</li> </ul>

SCHOOL DISTRICTS <sup>12</sup>	
WAYNE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 full-time reading coach hired</li> <li>• 1 reading paraprofessional hired</li> <li>• Professional development provided for teachers</li> <li>• Literacy assessments developed (pre-kindergarten assessment; TPRI; QRI)</li> <li>• I Can Read tutoring provided</li> <li>• Home interventions provided (visits, summer reading, parent involvement)</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development staff conducted workshops; developed literacy framework; helped teachers with small groups, individualized instruction, monthly collaboration, assessment</li> <li>• Assessments (PreK, TPRI, QRI, CRT) used to guide instruction, identify at-risk students, develop ILPs</li> <li>• Reading coaches and paraprofessionals administered K-3 intervention groups (Tier 2 and 3), one-to-one instruction and tutoring (I Can Read), developed ILPs</li> <li>• Home interventions developed K-3 home curriculum; delivered small group instruction; facilitated reading program</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development staff ensure that teachers recognize the value of assessment and use it to drive curriculum</li> <li>• Teachers use assessment to group according to small group identification; prepare learning strategies; correlate areas of weakness with Utah Core Curriculum</li> <li>• Students master prerequisite skills; gain literacy knowledge; increase motivation</li> <li>• Home interventions increase student attendance; parent awareness, knowledge, involvement; student confidence</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development staff increase instructional efficiency; ensure data-based decision making, positive teacher behavior</li> <li>• Teachers use assessment to increase instructional efficiency; base decisions on data; increase CRT scores</li> <li>• Increased CRT scores; more students reading on grade level, reading for enjoyment</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased student achievement and mastery of Utah Core Curriculum standards and objectives</li> <li>• Students as lifelong learners, responsible citizens</li> </ul>
WEBER SCHOOL DISTRICT	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 28 reading teachers/literacy coaches hired</li> <li>• Literacy materials provided for Tier 2 intervention</li> <li>• DIBELS assessment materials provided</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers/Coaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained to work with small group intervention program</li> <li>• Took part in USOE Reading First Summer Reading Academy and follow-up</li> <li>• Participated in monthly study groups, sharing sessions</li> <li>• Attended two-day literacy coach workshop with Dr. Jan Hasbrouck</li> <li>• Trained in administering and interpreting DIBELS</li> <li>• Attended presentation on word work and fluency by Dr. Jack Pikulski</li> <li>• Received a variety of in-service training</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1,473 kindergarten students, 1,142 grade 1 students, 1,118 grade 2 students, 1,027 grade 3 students received reading intervention</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading teachers/coaches are highly motivated due to supportive professional development and positive student achievement</li> <li>• 2,651 students received intervention (I Can Read, Cross Age Tutoring) to improve literacy proficiency</li> <li>• 2,109 students received Tier 2 intervention (Early Reading Intervention, Early Success, Soar to Success)</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All Utah Language Arts CRT scores at grades 1-3 will be maintained or improve</li> <li>• Data will continue to indicate increased reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS</li> </ul>

CHARTER SCHOOLS	
FREEDOM ACADEMY	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading tutor hired</li> <li>• Classroom leveled readers, Big Books, nonfiction readers, and reading games purchased</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through grade-level teams, delivery of curriculum continually monitored, assessed, and revised as needed to improve all student reading levels</li> <li>• Assessed student progress using continual running records, vocabulary tests, and spelling and written assessments</li> <li>• Trained in Spalding methods</li> <li>• Took part in back-to-school in-service training, weekly grade-level meetings, quarterly planning days</li> <li>• Assessment data used to determine goals and target areas of reading weakness</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped for instruction using data from state, school, and classroom assessments</li> <li>• Took part in small group one-on-one tutoring, after-school homework support, lunch time reading practice</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received student's progress information via class newsletters, open houses, and school website</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students will participate in Tier 1 of school's plan; they will receive Spalding instruction with differentiated instruction and interventions as needed</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through ongoing assessments, students at the Tier 2 level will be assigned a reading tutor and/or parent volunteer under the direction of the classroom teacher</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students at the Tier 3 level will work with special ed/intensive learning teachers and support programs</li> </ul>

CHARTER SCHOOLS	
NORTH DAVIS PREP ACADEMY	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Literacy aide to administer DIBELS</li> <li>• Professional development in phonics, fluency, and comprehension for K-6 teachers</li> <li>• Classroom materials to support phonics, fluency, and comprehension</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in phonics, fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary strategies</li> <li>• Trained to use DIBELS data to inform instruction and accurately identify each student's need for academic growth</li> <li>• Maintained weekly and monthly test scores in a permanent student portfolio</li> <li>• Took part in mentoring program as well as reading assessment, instruction, and classroom management seminars</li> </ul> <p><b>Literacy Aides</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided academic support to all primary school students during reading instruction</li> <li>• Trained to administer DIBELS</li> </ul> <p><b>Principals</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observed and evaluated each teacher twice per year</li> <li>• Helped teachers set professional goals and develop individual growth plans</li> <li>• Met periodically with teachers to analyze student assessment data</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Struggling readers tutored before and after school and during the summer</li> <li>• Tested weekly on phonograms in kindergarten</li> <li>• Given weekly spelling tests (mid-K through grade 3)</li> <li>• In grades 2-3, students tested monthly to determine individual grade-level achievement in spelling and reading comprehension</li> <li>• Gain scores collected following each benchmark assessment</li> <li>• Given end-of-year skills mastery test</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received progress and portfolio updates at parent/teacher conferences and on report cards</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 475 students received progress monitoring</li> <li>• 68 students received additional DIBELS progress monitoring</li> <li>• 47 students received Tier 2/3 services</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS (K) and Utah CRTs (Gr 1-3)</li> </ul>
OGDEN PREP ACADEMY	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professional development for teaching literacy skills, administering and interpreting DIBELS assessment</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biweekly review meetings held to review student literacy growth</li> <li>• Monthly meetings held to review strategies being used to teach specific skills</li> <li>• Classroom management coach observed teachers and gave critical feedback for more effective instruction</li> <li>• Teachers trained to administer DIBELS</li> <li>• 12 teachers trained to review and use assessment data to plan and implement instruction for struggling readers</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 225 students reviewed monthly for reading proficiency</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utah Language Arts CRT scores will show a 10% proficiency increase at grades 1-3</li> </ul>

CHARTER SCHOOLS	
PINNACLE CANYON ACADEMY	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 teachers given additional duties as Instructional Leaders</li> <li>• New curriculum researched and purchased</li> <li>• Professional development provided in DIBELS</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Instructional Leaders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Observed, supported, and trained classroom teachers</li> </ul> <p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grouped students and offered differentiated instruction based on assessment results</li> <li>• 2 special education teachers trained in DIBELS</li> <li>• All K-3 teachers sent to summer Instructional Academy to train in new curriculum</li> <li>• Provided with financial support to pursue masters degree in reading</li> </ul> <p><b>Students</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Took part in literacy activities from 8:30-10:30 daily without interruptions</li> <li>• Given additional support via after-school tutoring</li> </ul> <p><b>Parents</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offered daily progress report (homework, grades, assignments) via Student Information System (SIS)</li> <li>• Received printed progress report every two weeks</li> <li>• Two parent/teacher conferences held per year</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• K-3 students assessed regularly to determine areas of need</li> <li>• Students given specific and additional help as needed</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students given books to read on their own reading level</li> <li>• 94% of K-3 students reading on or above grade level</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 95% of K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS (K) and Utah CRT (1-3)</li> </ul>
SUMMIT ACADEMY	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional instructors hired for small group instruction</li> <li>• School offers extended Friday phonics/reading class to students requiring assistance ("Fun Friday Phonics")</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<p><b>Teachers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trained in phonics and language arts strategies</li> <li>• Attended workshops with qualified trainers in each core curriculum area, including Multiple Intelligences training</li> <li>• Participated in regular staff collaboration sessions to reinforce methods</li> <li>• Took part in grade-level meetings to collaborate on lesson plans and share insights</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<p><b>SHORT TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students participated in small group instruction and 2004-05 CRT testing</li> </ul> <p><b>MEDIUM TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DIBELS adopted for 2005-06</li> </ul> <p><b>LONG TERM</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by DIBELS (K) and Utah CRT (1-3)</li> </ul>



CHARTER SCHOOLS	
THOMAS EDISON CHARTER SCHOOL	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supplemental history books, reading comprehension books, and dictionaries purchased</li> <li>• Partial salary of on-site instructional specialist</li> <li>• Partial salaries of teachers (for tutoring) and classroom aides</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<b>Teachers</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided with 3 in-service training days on reading comprehension strategies</li> <li>• Continuously observed and informally evaluated student achievement to adjust instruction to meet students' needs</li> <li>• Administered norm-referenced, standardized assessments to measure how well students are doing relative to their peers and grade-level standards</li> <li>• Trained to implement Spalding Method</li> <li>• Observed by instructional specialist and offered immediate feedback</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<b>SHORT TERM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 208 students taught series totaling 70 phonograms; students practice and use phonograms in word building exercises</li> <li>• All students in need of intervention offered tutoring</li> </ul> <b>MEDIUM TERM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80% of K students knew all 70 phonograms and were spelling at a 2.23 grade level</li> <li>• All grade 1 students improved on spelling scores by 1.65 grade levels</li> <li>• All 2nd and 3rd grade students improved by an average of 1.43 grade levels</li> </ul> <b>LONG TERM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will continue to make above-grade-level progress in spelling and reading comprehension</li> </ul>
TIMPANOGOS ACADEMY	
Inputs/ Uses of Program Funds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 Language Arts specialist hired for SY2005-06</li> </ul>
Activities/ Program Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff trained on Spalding Method of Language Arts</li> <li>• Spalding trainer spent time with entire staff to review training and assist with implementation</li> <li>• Parent trainings (conducted by certified Spalding trainer) started during 3rd term and will continue each term next year</li> </ul>
Program Outcomes	<b>SHORT TERM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All students received Spalding Method of Language Arts to improve reading proficiency</li> </ul> <b>MEDIUM TERM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to Spalding, 100% of kindergarten students met proficiency in letter naming, 98% were proficient in phonogram recognition</li> <li>• All students in grades 1-3 improved their Language Arts scores according to Spalding</li> </ul> <b>LONG TERM</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 90% of K-3 students will reach reading proficiency as measured by Spalding at kindergarten and Utah Language Arts CRT at grades 1-3</li> </ul>

### SECTION 3: First-Year Proficiency Goals, Summative Assessments, and Results\*

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
<b>ALPINE</b>								
K	Reduce percentage of students not passing DRA level 3 to below 25%.	DRA Oral Rdg	28% not passing	24%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Decrease the percentage of students at UT CRT levels 1 and 2 by 1%.	CRT <sup>14</sup>	L1: 7% L2: 13% Total: 20%	L1: 6% L2: 13% Total: 19%	Yes	82.3%	81.8%	-0.5%
2	Reduce individual achievement gap by 1% on district value-added Gr 2 core test as compared to Gr 1 core test for students below CRT scaled score (155).	CRT	150	155 (3.3%)	Yes	80.8%	83.7%	+2.9%
3	Reduce individual achievement gap by 1% on district value-added Gr 3 core test as compared to Gr 2 core test for students below CRT scaled score (155).	CRT	149	153 (2.6%)	Yes	80.8%	80.0%	-0.8%
<b>BEAVER</b>								
K	Long term: 80% of students will reach reading proficiency on DIBELS	DIBELS LNF	10%	97%	Yes	--	--	--
		DIBELS PSF	48%	92%	Yes			
1	Long term: 80% of students will reach reading proficiency on DRA	DRA	37%	72%	Yes	75.6%	79.7%	+4.1%
2	Long term: 80% of students will reach reading proficiency on DRA	DRA	62%	93%	Yes	88.1%	92.9%	+4.8%
3	Long term: 80% of students will reach reading proficiency on DRA	DRA	71%	91%	Yes	76.7%	79.5%	+2.8%

\* Data in the six left columns were reported by fully participating districts and charter schools via first-year Annual Reading Proficiency Reports submitted to the USOE in Summer/Fall 2005. The data in the three right columns represent preliminary proficiency rates on the Utah Language Arts CRT for SY2003-04 and SY2004-05, alongside subsequent gains. There are statistical considerations involved with these CRT figures. First, the test evaluates students' reading, writing, and listening skills; not reading progress. Second, many districts focused their literacy efforts on the kindergarten level, where no statewide CRT assessment is available. Third, the 2004 and 2005 CRT results depict two different grade-level cohorts, of varying sizes. And fourth, among charter schools and smaller school districts, a single student can have a disproportionate statistical impact on the overall proficiency rate.

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
<b>BOX ELDER</b>								
K	61% at DIBELS LNF & PSF benchmark	DIBELS LNF/PSF	35%	61%	Yes	--	--	--
1	76% proficient on UT CRT	CRT	74%	78%	Yes	73.9%	77.8%	+3.9%
2	79% proficient on UT CRT	CRT	77%	74%	No	77.9%	73.5%	-4.4%
3	80% proficient on UT CRT	CRT	80%	78%	No	80.0%	78.1%	-1.9%
<b>CACHE COUNTY</b>								
K	Long term: 80% of students will reach reading proficiency on PSF subtest	DIBELS PSF	78%	86%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Long term: 90% of students will achieve proficiency on CRT	CRT	91.9%	90.8%	Yes	91.9%	90.8%	-1.1%
2	Long term: 90% of students will achieve proficiency on CRT	CRT	90.4%	93.5%	Yes	90.4%	93.5%	+3.1%
3	Long term: 90% of students will achieve proficiency on CRT	CRT	90.6%	92.0%	Yes	90.6%	92.0%	+1.4%
<b>CARBON</b>								
K	Continuous improvement; more students proficient on DIBELS	DIBELS LNF	55%	70%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Continuous improvement; more students proficient on CRT, DIBELS	CRT	84.4%	80.3%	No	84.4%	80.3%	-4.1%
		DIBELS PSF	60%	80%	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	59%	71%	Yes			
2	Continuous improvement; more students proficient on CRT, DIBELS	CRT	84.4%	80.3%	No	84.4%	80.3%	-4.1%
		DIBELS PSF	60%	80%	Yes			
3	Continuous improvement; more students proficient on CRT, DIBELS	CRT	81.5%	80.9%	No	81.5%	80.9%	-0.6%
		DIBELS ORF	42%	45%	Yes			

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
DAGGETT								
K	DIBELS: 80% scoring some risk or better	DIBELS LNF	33% At Risk	20% At Risk	Yes	--	--	--
		DIBELS PSF	11% At Risk	0% At Risk	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	22% At Risk	20% At Risk	Yes			
1	CRT: 70% proficient in 2005	CRT	88%	100%	Yes	87.5%	100.0%	+12.5%
	DIBELS: 80% scoring some risk or better	DIBELS PSF	14% At Risk	0% At Risk	Yes			
		DIBELS NWF	14% At Risk	0% At Risk	Yes			
		DIBELS ORF	NA	13% At Risk	Yes			
	QRI: 70% on grade level in 2005	QRI	75% On Level	75% On Level	Yes			
2	CRT: 70% proficient in 2005	CRT	100%	64%	No	100.0%	63.6%	-36.4%
	DIBELS: 80% scoring some risk or better	DIBELS ORF	10% At Risk	30% At Risk	No			
	QRI: 70% on grade level in 2005	QRI	55% On Level	55% On Level	No			
3	CRT: 70% proficient in 2005	CRT	100%	73%	Yes	100.0%	73.3%	-26.7%
	DIBELS: 80% scoring some risk or better	DIBELS ORF	0% At Risk	0% At Risk	Yes			
DAVIS								
K	Comparison of means for Post-K Assessment	K Pre/ Post-test	Pre 76%	Post 90%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Matched student comparison of CRT median scale scores. (Gr 1 to Gr 2)	CRT	169 (Gr1)	169 (Gr2)	Yes	78.2%	77.9%	-0.3%
	Reading level gain for students receiving reading interventions.	QRI	NA	1 yr, 2 mo gain	Yes			
2	Matched student comparison of CRT median scale scores. (Gr 2 to Gr 3)	CRT	168 (Gr2)	169 (Gr3)	Yes	82.4%	82.3%	-0.1%
	Reading level gain for students receiving reading interventions.	QRI	NA	2 yr, 3 mo gain	Yes			
3	Matched student comparison of CRT median scale scores. (Gr 3 to Gr 4)	CRT	168 (Gr3)	169 (Gr4)	Yes	80.7%	80.5%	-0.2%
	Reading level gain for students receiving reading interventions.	QRI	NA	1 yr, 7 mo gain	Yes			

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
DUCHESNE CO.								
K	2% more at benchmark (35) on DIBELS PSF	DIBELS PSF	64% Lo Risk 19% Some Risk 18% At Risk	81% Establ 15% Emerg 4% Defic	Yes	--	--	--
1	2% more at proficient level on CRT	CRT	82.7%	79.5%	No	82.7%	79.5%	-3.2%
2	2% more at proficient level on CRT	CRT	78.0%	78.4%	No	78.0%	78.4%	+0.4%
3	2% more at proficient level on CRT	CRT	77.1%	77.2%	No	77.1%	77.2%	+0.1%
EMERY COUNTY								
K	Decrease in percentage scoring at risk on DIBELS LNF and PSF	DIBELS LNF	30% At Risk	25% At Risk	Yes	--	--	--
		DIBELS PSF	18% At Risk	8% At Risk	Yes			
1	CRT: Increased percentage of cohort ranking sufficient or above (K to Gr1)	CRT	NA	78.7%	NA	89.9%	78.7%	-11.2%
2	CRT: Increased percentage of cohort ranking sufficient or above (Gr1 to Gr2)	CRT	89.9% (Gr1)	85.1% (Gr2)	No	79.1%	85.1%	+6.0%
3	CRT: Increased percentage of cohort ranking sufficient or above (Gr2 to Gr3)	CRT	79.1% (Gr2)	90.0% (Gr3)	Yes	81.8%	90.0%	+8.2%
GARFIELD								
K	All students will show progress each year. At least 90% will progress by one grade level.	DIBELS	NA	67% Established	Yes			
1	All students will show progress each year. At least 90% will progress by one grade level.	CRT	89.7%	93.0%	Yes	89.7%	93.0%	+3.3%
		DIBELS	NA	78% Established	Yes			
2	All students will show progress each year. At least 90% will progress by one grade level.	CRT	82.1%	83.1%	Yes	82.1%	83.1%	+1.0%
		DIBELS	NA	54% Established	Yes			
3	All students will show progress each year. At least 90% will progress by one grade level.	CRT	68.7%	72.6%	Yes	68.7%	72.6%	+3.9%
		DIBELS	NA	54% Established	Yes			

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
GRAND COUNTY								
K	70% achieving benchmark	Ltr Recognition	70%	94%	Yes	--	--	--
		Ltr/Snd Assoc	51%	86%	Yes			
		Sound Segm	51%	71%	Yes			
		Elem Sp Surv	64%	87%	Yes			
		HFW Read	40%	71%	Yes			
		HFW Written	62%	82%	Yes			
		DIBELS PSF	NA	50%	No			
		DIBELS LNF	NA	48%	No			
1	CRT: 78% Sufficient or above in 2005	CRT	83.5%	87.4%	Yes	83.5%	87.4%	+3.9%
	70% achieving benchmark	Elem Sp Surv	64%	82%	Yes			
		Guided Rdg	58%	60%	No			
		DIBELS NWF	NA	55%	No			
		DIBELS ORF	NA	55%	No			
2	CRT: 78% Sufficient or above in 2005	CRT	75.7%	79.2%	Yes	75.7%	79.2%	+3.5%
	70% achieving benchmark	Guided Rdg	58%	84%	Yes			
3	CRT: 78% Sufficient or above in 2005	CRT	87.8%	80.7%	Yes	87.8%	80.7%	-7.1%
	70% achieving benchmark	Guided Rdg	75%	68%	No			
GRANITE								
K	Measurable gains in Concepts of Print, Phonemic Awareness, Comprehension, Literacy Background	USOE K tests	NA	NA	Yes	--	--	--
1	Increase in proficient students	CRT	69%	70%	Yes	69.3%	69.5%	+0.2%
2	Increase in proficient students	CRT	68%	71%	Yes	68.4%	70.8%	+2.4%
3	Increase in proficient students	CRT	66%	68%	Yes	66.4%	67.6%	+1.2%

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
IRON COUNTY								
K	Long term: Increase students reading at grade level by 5% per year	DIBELS LNF	NA	28% gain	Yes	--	--	--
1	Long term: Increase students reading at grade level by 5% per year	CRT	80.3%	82.4%	No	80.3%	82.4%	+2.1%
		DIBELS	NA	23% gain	Yes			
2	Long term: Increase students reading at grade level by 5% per year	CRT	82.9%	85.0%	No	82.9%	85.0%	+2.1%
		DIBELS	NA	7% gain	Yes			
3	Long term: Increase students reading at grade level by 5% per year	CRT	84.7%	87.1%	No	84.7%	87.1%	+2.4%
		DIBELS	NA	3% gain	No			
JORDAN <sup>15</sup>								
K	More students reading on grade level	Assorted tests	76%	87%	Yes	--	--	--
1	More students reading on grade level	Assorted tests	74%	84%	Yes	80.1%	77.5%	-2.6%
	Long term: 90% reading proficiency	CRT	80.1%	77.5%	No			
2	More students reading on grade level	Assorted tests	78%	86%	Yes	81.6%	80.4%	-1.2%
	Long term: 90% reading proficiency	CRT	81.6%	80.4%	No			
3	More students reading on grade level	Assorted tests	78%	86%	Yes	79.4%	77.9%	-1.5%
	Long term: 90% reading proficiency	CRT	79.4%	77.9%	No			
JUAB								
K	Students meet/exceed 1 year's growth	DRA	NA	NA	NA	--	--	--
1	85% proficiency	CRT <sup>16</sup>	88.8%	95.4%	Yes	88.8%	95.4%	+6.6%
2	85% proficiency	CRT	92.9%	95.0%	Yes	92.9%	95.0%	+2.1%
3	85% proficiency	CRT	89.8%	86.4%	Yes	89.8%	86.4%	-3.4%

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
KANE								
K	The percent of students meeting or exceeding DIBELS PSF and NWF benchmarks will increase 2% per year	DIBELS PSF	64% low risk	85% establ	Yes	--	--	--
		DIBELS NWF	63% low risk	79% low risk	Yes			
1	71% proficient	CRT	84%	80%	Yes	85.9%	82.3%	-3.6%
	82% at 50 sounds per minute	DIBELS NWF	37% low risk	82% low risk	Yes			
	77%@40 wpm low risk	DIBELS ORF	59% low risk	77% low risk	Yes			
2	85% sufficient or above	CRT	84%	89%	Yes	84.4%	92.2%	+7.8%
	59% at 90 wpm low risk	DIBELS ORF	51% low risk	59% low risk	Yes			
3	85% sufficient or above	CRT	83%	80%	No	87.0%	80.5%	-6.5%
	47% at 110 wpm low risk	DIBELS ORF	45% low risk	47% low risk	Yes			
	58% National Percentile Rank	Iowa Rdg	67%	NA	NA			
	54% National Percentile Rank	Iowa Lang	54%	NA	NA			
LOGAN CITY								
K	90% proficient	DIBELS LNF	51%	99.6%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Lower percentage below grade level 90% proficient	CRT	12.0%	14.5%	No	88.0%	85.5%	-2.5%
		DIBELS NWF	67%	99.8%	Yes			
2	Lower percentage below grade level 90% proficient	CRT	11.3%	9.5%	Yes	88.7%	90.5%	+1.8%
		DIBELS ORF	60%	100.0%	Yes			
3	Lower percentage below grade level 90% proficient	CRT	14.3%	10.9%	Yes	85.7%	89.1%	+3.4%
		DIBELS ORF	65%	99.6%	Yes			
MILLARD								
K	45% with 40 or more correct	DIBELS LNF	NA	46%@40+	Yes	--	--	--
	45% with 35 or more correct	DIBELS PSF	NA	45%@35+	Yes			
1	71% Sufficient or above	CRT	77.9%	79.9%	Yes	77.9%	79.9%	+2.0%
2	71% Sufficient or above	CRT	78.7%	82.3%	Yes	78.7%	82.3%	+3.6%
3	71% Sufficient or above	CRT	78.2%	74.2%	Yes	78.2%	74.2%	-4.0%



DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
MORGAN								
K	8 correct initial sounds to 25 by mid-year	DIBELS ISF	88%	87%	Yes	--	--	--
	8 correct letters to 40 by end of year	DIBELS LNF	91%	83%	Yes			
1	Maintain 35 correct phonemes	DIBELS PSF	81%	100%	Yes	95.9%	91.7%	-4.2%
	20 correct wpm to 40 by end of year	DIBELS ORF	99%	96%	Yes			
2	44 correct wpm to 90 by end of year	DIBELS ORF	81%	87%	Yes	88.7%	88.0%	-0.7%
3	77 correct wpm to 110 by end of year	DIBELS ORF	86%	93%	Yes	84.5%	87.4%	+2.9%
MURRAY CITY								
K	Less than 15% at risk	DIBELS LNF	22% At Risk	23% At Risk	No	--	--	--
	Less than 15% deficit	DIBELS PSF	19% Deficit	6% Deficit	Yes			
1	CRT: 78% proficient	CRT	76.6%	76.4%	No	76.6%	76.4%	-0.2%
2	CRT: 82% proficient	CRT	84.4%	83.6%	Yes	84.4%	83.6%	-0.8%
3	CRT: 78% proficient	CRT	78.5%	80.7%	Yes	78.5%	80.7%	+2.2%
NEBO								
K		DIBELS	NA	NA	NA	--	--	--
1	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	84.5%	83.8%	Yes	84.5%	83.8%	-0.7%
		Benchmark	11%	83.5%	Yes			
2	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	84.5%	82.9%	Yes	84.0%	82.9%	-1.1%
		Benchmark	33%	80%	Yes			
3	CRT: 75% proficient	CRT	83.7%	82.9%	Yes	83.7%	82.9%	-0.8%
		Benchmark	34%	76.6%	Yes			
NORTH SANPETE								
K	80% scoring 35 or more by 2007	DIBELS PSF	70% Established	90% Established	Yes	--	--	--
1	CRT: 71% proficient	CRT	71.4%	78.7%	Yes	71.5%	78.7%	+7.2%
2	CRT: 71% proficient	CRT	72.5%	85.6%	Yes	75.0%	85.6%	+10.6%
3	CRT: 71% proficient	CRT	73.6%	64.3%	No	77.5%	64.3%	-13.2%

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
NORTH SUMMIT								
K	Continuous improvement; more students on or above grade level	DIBELS	NA	82% bench	NA	--	--	--
1	Continuous improvement; more students on or above grade level	CRT DIBELS	85% NA	76% 68% bench	No	84.8%	75.7%	-9.1%
2	Continuous improvement; more students on or above grade level	CRT DIBELS	95% NA	89% 69% bench	No	95.0%	88.9%	-6.1%
3	Continuous improvement; more students on or above grade level	CRT DIBELS	78% NA	85% 60% bench	Yes	77.9%	84.6%	+6.7%
OGDEN CITY								
K	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ISF, PSF	54%	74%	Yes	--	--	--
1	CRT: 71% proficient	CRT	61.7%	64.0%	No	61.7%	64.0%	+2.3%
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS PSF, NWF, ORF	43%	52%	Yes			
2	CRT: 71% proficient	CRT	65.2%	68.9%	No	65.2%	68.9%	+3.7%
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	37%	47%	Yes			
3	CRT: 71% proficient	CRT	61.6%	67.1%	No	61.6%	67.1%	+5.5%
	10% fewer students not at benchmark	DIBELS ORF	34%	43%	Yes			
PARK CITY								
K	80% reaching benchmark	DIBELS PSF	63% Establ.	76% Establ.	Yes	--	--	--
1	Increase proficiency percentage	CRT	76.8%	74.2%	No	76.8%	74.2%	-2.6%
	80% reaching benchmark	DIBELS PSF	46% Establ.	92% Establ.	Yes			
2	Increase proficiency percentage	CRT	81.9%	80.6%	No	81.9%	80.6%	-1.3%
	80% reaching benchmark	DIBELS ORF	57% Low Risk	60% Low Risk	No			
3	Increase proficiency percentage	CRT	82.9%	82.1%	No	82.9%	82.1%	-0.8%
	80% reaching benchmark	DIBELS ORF	60% Low Risk	59% Low Risk	No			
PIUTE								
K	NA	PreK test	76%	76%	Yes	--	--	--
1	NA	CRT	77%	87%	Yes	73.3%	85.7%	+12.4%
2	NA	CRT	82%	71%	Yes	75.0%	70.0%	-5.0%
3	NA	CRT	73%	67%	Yes	42.1%	69.2%	+27.1%

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
PROVO								
K	Yearly increase in gain	Dist K test	69% Gain	69% Gain	No	--	--	--
1	CRT: 2% increase in proficiency	CRT	83.7%	82.4%	No	83.7%	82.4%	-1.3%
	Yearly increase in gain	DRA	71%	65%	No			
2	CRT: 2% increase in proficiency	CRT	76.0%	79.4%	Yes	76.0%	79.4%	+3.4%
	Yearly increase in gain	DRA	72%	74%	Yes			
3	CRT: 2% increase in proficiency	CRT	78.5%	77.9%	No	78.5%	77.9%	-0.6%
	Yearly increase in gain	DRP	61%	77%	Yes			
RICH								
K	Long term: 80% proficient on CBM, STAR, UT LA Core Curriculum	Classroom	25%	95%	Yes	--	--	--
		CBM LSF	13	41	Yes			
		CBM LNF	41	72	Yes			
1	Long term: 80% proficient on CBM, STAR, UT LA Core Curriculum	STAR	1.0	2.3	Yes	84.2%	86.2%	+2.0%
		CBM R-CBM	19	87	Yes			
		CBM Maze	5	16	Yes			
		CBM Spelling	24	29	Yes			
2	Long term: 80% proficient on CBM, STAR, UT LA Core Curriculum	STAR	1.1	3.0	Yes	100.0%	88.6%	-11.4%
		CBM R-CBM	73	120	Yes			
		CBM Maze	7	21	Yes			
		CBM Spelling	43	61	Yes			
3	Long term: 80% proficient on CBM, STAR, UT LA Core Curriculum	STAR	3.5	4.5	Yes	96.0%	92.6%	-3.4%
		CBM R-CBM	79	138	Yes			
		CBM Maze	10	26	Yes			
		CBM Spelling	65	81	Yes			

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
<b>SALT LAKE CITY</b>								
K	Increased proficiency on SLCSK K assessments	All K LA	60%	77%	Yes	--	--	--
		All K Math	72%	87%	Yes			
		1/2 day K LA	62.4%	77.2%	Yes			
		1/2 day K Math	75.2%	88.0%	Yes			
		Full day K LA	52.4%	77.2%	Yes			
		Full day K Math	67.2%	86.3%	Yes			
1	Long term: Increase % of students reading on grade level	CRT	67.8%	62.9%	No	67.8%	62.9%	-4.9%
2	Long term: Increase % of students reading on grade level	CRT	66.7%	68.6%	Yes	66.7%	68.6%	+1.9%
		DRA	69.8% (Gr1)	88.3% (Gr2)	Yes			
3	Long term: Increase % of students reading on grade level	CRT	66.6%	69.2%	Yes	66.6%	69.2%	+2.6%
<b>SAN JUAN</b>								
K	Each grade improves 5% yearly	DIBELS NWF	71%	82%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Each grade improves 5% yearly	DIBELS ORF	54%	56%	No	62.5%	62.7%	+0.2%
2	Each grade improves 5% yearly	DIBELS ORF	45%	46%	No	58.5%	75.9%	+17.4%
3	Each grade improves 5% yearly	DIBELS ORF	45%	50%	Yes	59.3%	60.1%	+0.8%
<b>SEVIER</b>								
K	85% or more giving correct response on Phonemic Awareness subtest	USOE PA	85%	85%	Yes	--	--	--
	91% or more giving correct response on Comprehension subtest	USOE Comp	91%	89%	No			
1	CRT: 71% sufficient or above	CRT	84.7%	83.8%	Yes	84.7%	83.8%	-0.9%
2	CRT: 71% sufficient or above	CRT	85.1%	84.7%	Yes	85.1%	84.7%	-0.4%
3	CRT: 90% sufficient or above	CRT	89.6%	87.5%	No	89.6%	87.5%	-2.1%

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
SOUTH SANPETE								
K	Long term: 80% achieving benchmark	DIBELS	77%	78%	No	--	--	--
1	NA	CRT	90.5%	84.1%	Yes	90.5%	84.1%	-6.4%
	Long term: 80% achieving benchmark	DIBELS	83%	83%				
2	NA	CRT	85.6%	87.0%	No	85.6%	87.0%	+1.4%
	Long term: 80% achieving benchmark	DIBELS	73%	73%				
3	NA	CRT	86.4%	85.7%	Yes	86.4%	85.7%	-0.7%
	Long term: 80% achieving benchmark	DIBELS	73%	81%				
SOUTH SUMMIT								
K	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS PSF	30% at risk	8% deficit	Yes	--	--	--
		DIBELS NWF	39% at risk	23% at risk				
		DIBELS LNF	35% at risk	26% at risk				
1	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	11% at risk	11% at risk	Yes	86.9%	88.4%	+1.5%
	NA	CRT	86.9%	88.4%				
2	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	27% at risk	33% at risk	No	85.6%	83.8%	-1.8%
	NA	CRT	85.6%	83.8%				
3	Long term: 80% proficient	DIBELS ORF	24% at risk	17% at risk	Yes	77.9%	85.3%	+7.4%
	NA	CRT	77.9%	85.3%				

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
TINTIC								
K	73% meeting/exceeding 1 year's growth	USOE post-test	36%	94%	Yes	--	--	--
	90% sufficient or above	Teacher CRT	NA	100%	Yes			
1	90% sufficient or above	CRT	93.3%	77.8%	No	93.3%	77.8%	-15.5%
	73% meeting/exceeding 1 year's growth	QRI 3	31%	100%	Yes			
2	90% sufficient or above	CRT	100.0%	93.8%	Yes	100.0%	93.8%	-6.2%
	73% meeting/exceeding 1 year's growth	QRI 3	60%	88%	Yes			
3	90% sufficient or above	CRT	88.2%	100.0%	Yes	88.2%	100.0%	+11.8%
	73% meeting/exceeding 1 year's growth	QRI 3	91%	100%	Yes			
TOOELE COUNTY <sup>17</sup>								
K	NA	UT K test A UT K test B UT K test C UT K test D	89 7 3 1	89 7 3 1	Yes	--	--	--
1	Increased proficiency	CRT	81.3%	79.7%	No	81.3%	79.7%	-1.6%
	NA	Phon Awar Phonics Vocab. Compr.	85 88 90 84	82 86 90 84	Yes			
2	Increased proficiency	CRT	81.1%	81.4%	Yes	81.1%	81.4%	+0.3%
	NA	Phonics Vocab. Comp.	88 86 81	87 88 81	Yes			
3	Increased proficiency	CRT	82.5%	81.1%	No	82.5%	81.1%	-1.4%
	NA	Phonics Vocab. Comp.	78 81 78	78 80 83	Yes			

DISTRICT SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY RATES <sup>13</sup>		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
UINTAH								
K	NA	K Pre/Post-test	68% correct	89% correct	Yes	--	--	--
1	71% proficient	CRT	83.3%	79.8%	Yes	83.3%	79.8%	-3.5%
2	71% proficient	CRT	81.6%	84.3%	Yes	81.6%	84.3%	+2.7%
3	71% proficient	CRT	78.4%	83.5%	Yes	78.4%	83.5%	+5.1%
WASATCH								
K	End-of-level: 93.7% proficient	End-level PA	93%	95%	Yes	--	--	--
1	CRT: 68.07% proficient	CRT	70.2%	78.7%	Yes	70.2%	78.7%	+8.5%
2	CRT: 79.35% proficient	CRT	81.0%	77.6%	No	81.0%	77.6%	-3.4%
3	CRT: 73.95% proficient	CRT	79.0%	74.3%	Yes	79.0%	74.3%	-4.7%
WASHINGTON COUNTY								
K	NA	USOE Pre/Post	87%	NA	NA	--	--	--
1	At least 90% proficient after 3 years	CRT	76.7%	75.6%	No	76.7%	75.6%	-1.1%
	5% increase (or 90%) at proficiency	DRA	75%	78%	No			
2	At least 90% proficient after 3 years	CRT	76.7%	79.0%	No	76.7%	79.0%	+2.3%
	5% increase (or 90%) at proficiency	DRA	83%	85%	No			
3	At least 90% proficient after 3 years	CRT	76.3%	74.1%	No	76.3%	74.1%	-2.2%
	5% increase (or 90%) at proficiency	DRA	87%	81%	No			
WAYNE COUNTY								
K	TPRI: 80% scoring 74% or higher	TPRI	69%	100%	Yes	--	--	--
1	CRT: 74% sufficient or above	CRT	84%	82%	Yes	83.8%	82.1%	-1.7%
2	CRT: 74% sufficient or above	CRT	84%	88%	Yes	83.8%	88.2%	+4.4%
3	CRT: 74% sufficient or above	CRT	78%	81%	Yes	78.8%	82.5%	+3.7%
WEBER								
K	Fewer students at risk	DIBELS PSF	386 students	120 students	Yes			
1	Fewer students at risk	DIBELS PSF	386	7	Yes	79.5%	80.1%	+0.6%
		DIBELS NWF	659	112	Yes			
2	Fewer students at risk	DIBELS ORF	499	489	Yes	82.5%	82.1%	-0.4%
3	Fewer students at risk	DIBELS ORF	491	347	Yes	77.4%	78.5%	+1.1%

CHARTER SCHOOL SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
FREEDOM ACADEMY								
K	Yearly measurable gains	Spalding	30%	75%	Yes	--	--	--
1	Yearly measurable gains	CRT	54.5%	76.5%	Yes	54.5%	76.5%	+22.0%
2	Yearly measurable gains	CRT	78.3%	88.3%	Yes	78.3%	88.3%	+10.0%
3	Yearly measurable gains	CRT	82.9%	81.0%	No	82.9%	81.0%	-1.9%
		IOWA tests	NA	68%				
NORTH DAVIS PREP <sup>18</sup>								
K	NA	Assorted tests	NA	88%	NA			
1	NA	CRT	NA	85.3%	NA	NA	85.3%	
		Assorted tests	NA	84%	NA			
2	NA	CRT	NA	80.3%	NA	NA	80.3%	
		Assorted tests	NA	87%	NA			
3	NA	CRT	NA	90.2%	NA	NA	90.2%	
		Assorted tests	NA	90%	NA			
OGDEN PREP ACADEMY								
K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	--	--	--
1	10% proficiency increase	CRT	52.4%	81.8%	Yes	52.4%	81.8%	+29.4%
	NA	DIBELS	NA	NA				
		Harcourt	NA	NA				
2	10% proficiency increase	CRT	70.6%	55.3%	No	70.6%	55.3%	-15.3%
	NA	DIBELS	NA	NA				
		Harcourt	NA	NA				
3	10% proficiency increase	CRT	73.9%	83.3%	No	73.9%	83.3%	+9.4%
	NA	DIBELS	NA	NA				
		Harcourt	NA	NA				
PINNACLE CANYON ACADEMY								
K	NA	EOL K test	71%	89%	Yes	--	--	--
1	NA	CRT	87.2%	63.9%	No	87.2%	63.9%	-23.3%
2	NA	CRT	82.9%	59.5%	No	82.9%	59.5%	-23.4%
3	NA	CRT	75.6%	80.8%	Yes	75.6%	80.8%	+5.2%



CHARTER SCHOOL SELF-REPORTED PROFICIENCY GOALS, SUMMATIVE ASSESSMENTS, AND RESULTS						CRT PROFICIENCY PERCENTAGES		
GRADE	GOAL	MEASURE	2004 BASELINE	2005 RESULT	GOAL MET?	2004 CRT	2005 CRT	GAIN
<b>SUMMIT ACADEMY</b>								
K	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	--	--	--
1	71% proficient	CRT	NA	93.2%	Yes	NA	93.2%	--
2	71% proficient	CRT	NA	89.6%	Yes	NA	89.6%	--
3	71% proficient	CRT	NA	94.4%	Yes	NA	94.4%	--
	Meet or surpass district averages	ITBS	NA	80% NPR	Yes			
<b>THOMAS EDISON CHARTER SCHOOL</b>								
K	NA	Morrison McCall Phonograms	NA NA	2.23 80%	Yes	--	--	--
1	NA	Morrison McCall	1.97	3.62	Yes	83.7%	81.8%	-1.9%
2	NA	Morrison McCall	3.38	4.63	Yes	68.0%	85.5%	+22.5%
3	NA	Morrison McCall	3.94	5.54	Yes	77.3%	79.4%	+2.1%
<b>TIMPANOGOS ACADEMY</b>								
K	90% proficiency	Spalding Phon.	10%	98%	No	--	--	--
1	90% proficiency	CRT	85.4%	81.3%	No	85.4%	81.3%	-4.1%
2	90% proficiency	CRT	83.1%	85.4%	No	83.1%	85.4%	+2.3%
3	90% proficiency	CRT	81.6%	80.8%	No	81.6%	80.8%	-0.8%

## SECTION 4: What Has Been Accomplished?

This report describes the implementation of the K-3 Reading Improvement Program along with first-year results. WestEd analyzed the year-end Annual Reading Proficiency Reports provided by participating Utah school districts and charter schools along with reports provided by the USOE to determine a) how participants have thus far complied with the provisions of the state legislation, and b) the effects of the program after one year of implementation. WestEd also reviewed 2004 and 2005 CRT results to assess whether the first-year effects of the S.B. 230 reading initiative were reflected in statewide language arts tests.

WestEd's program analysis led to the following observations:

**Large-scale program implementation is underway.** The first year of Utah's K-3 Reading Improvement Program was characterized by massive efforts at both the state and district level. Implementation of the provisions of S.B. 230 was evident in every school district and charter school fully participating in the program, with 40 districts and 7 charters increasing their efforts to help all students read at grade level by third grade. Participants developed and submitted plans to the USOE describing research-based practices, assessment strategies, reading performance standards, and interventions, all designed to ensure third graders are reading at or above grade level. Districts provided matching funds (often via raising taxes) to initiate their new literacy efforts, set new reading proficiency targets, and facilitated program start-up on a large scale. Districts also used state funds to increase the number of reading coaches in elementary schools, hire additional support personnel for reading tutoring, purchase new instructional materials and assessment tools, provide literacy professional development for staff and parents, and offer full-day kindergarten. The literacy efforts were varied and widespread, yet were all directed toward the reading improvement goal laid out by the legislation. S.B. 230 has thus been a catalyst for progress statewide, with districts and charters establishing strategic literacy plans and making early reading a top priority.

**Research-based literacy strategies and best practices are being implemented.** WestEd's review of the first-year reading improvement plans submitted by program participants revealed a solid mix of promising literacy strategies and best practices, all designed to improve the reading performance of K-3 students. While S.B. 230 allowed local flexibility in determining how the reading intervention would take place and be assessed, the legislation wisely created an important role for the USOE and State Board of Education in setting standards for how the programs would actually be developed and implemented. As a result, most participants were able to teach reading to diverse learners in new ways; offer supplemental instruction to struggling readers; train teachers, principals, and parents to teach reading more effectively; and evaluate student progress using a variety of formative and summative literacy assessments.

And thus far, anecdotal evidence from Utah's education professionals has strongly supported the initiatives implemented under S.B. 230. As one kindergarten teacher explained, "We're not just passing (struggling readers) a rope anymore, we're pulling them up." Another added, "In 27 years, it's been the best thing that we've seen in education."<sup>19</sup>

**Leadership has been provided by the USOE.** The state provided significant levels of guidance and monitoring to participating districts and schools to ensure compliance with the S.B. 230 legislation. USOE oversight and assistance included publishing a statewide literacy framework along with evaluation rubrics, assessment guidelines, and reading tutoring programs, as well as hosting literacy training opportunities throughout the year for both teachers and principals. USOE's leadership helped participants take full advantage of this reading improvement opportunity, as the state was able to counsel participants to use program funds to support research-based practices and establish a common framework for literacy.

**The S.B. 230 legislation presents both opportunities and challenges for evaluation.** The S.B. 230 legislation provides matching state funds to improve early literacy and offers participants the freedom to determine their own assessments, proficiency targets, and improvement strategies. Thus, S.B. 230 emphasizes site-based management and local control. At the same time, this emphasis presents challenges for widespread evaluation. Without guidelines or requirements for standardized goals and outcome measures – and a resulting variety of program objectives and assessments – a broader and more rigorous evaluation of the program, including cross-district comparisons and definitive conclusions regarding effectiveness, is simply not feasible methodologically. However, WestEd was able to review self-reported year-end program information and outcomes, along with first-year assessment results, including CRT scores.

**End-of-year results from the first months of implementation are encouraging.** According to the year-end program information provided to WestEd by the USOE in Summer/Fall 2005, 31 districts and 3 charter schools reported their students met all first-year reading goals in kindergarten, while 23 districts and 4 charters met their goals at grade 1. At grade 2, 24 districts and 3 charters met their first-year goals, while 26 districts and 3 charters did so at grade 3. Twelve districts and 1 charter school met all of their K-3 proficiency goals.

In addition, WestEd looked at statewide CRT results for all participating districts and charter schools and displayed those results alongside participants' self-reported results (Section 3). This was done not as an audit of the self-reported results, but rather to examine whether the effects of participants' reading intervention strategies were evident on the statewide assessment. WestEd's CRT analysis revealed positive results. Eighteen districts and 2 charters saw increases in their overall grade 1 language arts proficiency

rate (percentage achieving Levels 3 and 4) from 2004 to 2005. Twenty-five districts and 3 charters raised their proficiency rates at grade 2, while 21 districts and three charters did so at grade 3. Notably, 6 school districts and 1 charter school saw higher 2005 proficiency rates at all three primary grades. (The following table illustrates the scale of CRT proficiency rate improvements.)

CRT Proficiency Rate Improvements, SY2003-04 to SY2004-05

	+ 0-4%	+ 4-8%	+ 8-12%	+12% or more
Grade 1 (20)	11	4	1	4
Grade 2 (28)	19	4	2	3
Grade 3 (24)	14	5	3	2

WestEd urges caution when evaluating the success of a reading improvement program after only the first year of implementation. In reality, no Utah district or charter school actually benefited from a full year of programming in year one. All participants needed time to raise matching funds, develop and submit plans, hire and train staff, and put intervention strategies into action.

Large-scale reading improvement takes time. For example, the coordinated early reading initiative established by Superintendent Roy Romer in Los Angeles's elementary schools — an effort that aligned reading instruction, assessment, intervention, and teacher professional development throughout the city — did not immediately result in measurable gains. But as the program progressed into its second and third year of implementation, students in the early grades began showing marked improvement.<sup>20</sup> Kentucky's Early Reading Incentive Grants (ERIG) program is also similar. First passed in 1998, ERIG offers grants to schools to support the implementation of replicable, research-based literacy models to meet the needs of struggling elementary readers. These models feature many of the elements implemented under S.B. 230, such as sustained professional development, ongoing assessment to monitor progress, and interventions for struggling readers. Now several years into ERIG, participating students are steadily raising their test scores.<sup>21</sup>

Overall, massive literacy improvement efforts are now underway in Utah, and S.B. 230 participants are headed in a positive direction. Ultimately, these efforts should result in continued reading growth in subsequent years.

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> The other sources of funding that currently support local literacy improvement efforts in Utah include district/school monies; Title I and special education funds; trust funds, and Parent Teacher Association, community, and business contributions.

<sup>2</sup> Due to staff turnover and new leadership, 4 charter schools did not submit year-end Annual Reading Proficiency Reports to the USOE in 2005. As such, only 7 charters were considered full program participants for the purposes of this report.

<sup>3</sup> Utah State Office of Education. (2005). *Improving Reading Proficiency: Utah's Year-End Report*. September 2005 PowerPoint presentation on S.B. 230 provided by USOE Elementary Language Arts Specialist Lynne Greenwood.

<sup>4</sup> "Bringing kids up to speed," *The Herald Journal*, Logan, UT, 8/21/05. "Schools hail Walker's reading program," *Deseret Morning News*, Salt Lake City, UT, 9/23/05.

<sup>5</sup> S.B. 230: *Reading Achievement Program*, State of Utah 2004 General Session, Enrolled Copy. See Appendix A for full text.

<sup>6</sup> Utah State Office of Education. (2005). *Utah K-3 Literacy Framework for Successful Instruction and Intervention*, page H6. Online at <http://www.usoe.k12.ut.us/sars/readingta/literacyframework.pdf>.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., H7.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., H2.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., H9-H11.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., H6.

<sup>11</sup> Standard deviation is the average departure from the mean.

<sup>12</sup> The data on program inputs, outputs, and outcomes in the Section 2 table were compiled from information submitted to the USOE by participating districts and charter schools via Summer/Fall 2005 Annual Reading Proficiency Reports.

<sup>13</sup> Proficiency rates are the percentages of students achieving Levels 3 and 4 on the Utah End of Year Language Arts CRT for SY2003-04 and SY2004-05. Data excludes home-schooled students, those spending less than a full academic year at their school, and students in private schools. Inclusion rules were based on "Blank," "Attempted," "Accommodated," and "UT Alternate Assessment" Participation Codes as well as a "V" (Valid) Record Status Code. These business rules were verified October 13, 2005, via phone discussions with Jerry Winkler, USOE IT Manager.

<sup>14</sup> Based on Alpine School District data: 4,192 1<sup>st</sup> grade student scores vs. 3,965 student scores reported to WestEd via USOE.

<sup>15</sup> Jordan District's assorted school-selected assessments include guided reading levels, running records, CRT proficiency, DIBELS, Early Success/Soar to Success, and other intervention tools.

<sup>16</sup> Juab School District has utilized both DRA and DIBELS for progress monitoring but will use CRTs to measure reading gains.

<sup>17</sup> Tooele District: "Original data provided by our Testing Director does not correlate with USOE data provided 10/14/05."

<sup>18</sup> The 2004-05 school year was the first year of operation for the North Davis Preparatory Academy. As such the school has no baseline proficiency data for 2004 or predetermined goals.

<sup>19</sup> "Bringing kids up to speed," *The Herald Journal*, Logan, UT, 8/21/05.

<sup>20</sup> Los Angeles Unified School District, Elementary Reading Plan Fact Sheet. Online at [http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us/newLAUSDnet/pdf/FACTSHEET\\_elementaryreading.pdf](http://www.lausd.k12.ca.us/newLAUSDnet/pdf/FACTSHEET_elementaryreading.pdf).

<sup>23</sup> McIntyre, E. (2002). *Research Report on Early Reading Incentive Grant Program (ERIG) Cohort II (2000-2002 Grant Years)*. University of Kentucky College of Education: Collaborative Center for Literacy Development.



## APPENDIX A: S.B. 230 Enrolled Copy (State of Utah 2004 General Session)

General Description: This bill creates the K-3 Reading Improvement Program.

Highlighted Provisions: This bill:

- provides definitions;
- creates the K-3 Reading Improvement Program to achieve the state's goals of having third graders reading at or above grade level;
- requires a school district or charter school to:
  - > submit a reading proficiency improvement plan to qualify to use program monies; and
  - > report on the expenditure of program monies;
- provides how program monies are to be allocated among qualifying school districts and charter schools;
- prohibits a school district or charter school from using program monies to supplant funds for existing programs;
- requires the State Board of Education to make rules to implement the program; and
- authorizes a local school board leeway to fund a school district's K-3 Reading Improvement Program.

Monies Appropriated in this Bill:

This bill appropriates from the Uniform School Fund to the State Board of Education for the K-3 Reading Improvement Program:

- \$2,500,000 for fiscal year 2004-05 only; and
- as an ongoing appropriation subject to future budget constraints, \$12,500,000 for fiscal year 2004-05.

Other Special Clauses: None

Utah Code Sections Affected: ENACTS:

53A-17a-150, Utah Code Annotated 1953

53A-17a-151, Utah Code Annotated 1953

Be it enacted by the Legislature of the state of Utah:

Section 1. Section 53A-17a-150 is enacted to read:

53A-17a-150. K-3 Reading Improvement Program.

1) As used in this section:

- a) "program" means the K-3 Reading Improvement Program; and
- b) "program monies" means:
  - i) school district revenue from the levy authorized under Section 53A-17a-151;
  - ii) school district revenue allocated to the program from other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, for the purpose of receiving state funds under this section; and
  - iii) monies appropriated by the Legislature to the program.

- 2) The K-3 Reading Improvement Program consists of program monies and is created to achieve the state's goal of having third graders reading at or above grade level.
- 3) Subject to future budget constraints, the Legislature may annually appropriate money to the K-3 Reading Improvement Program.
- 4) a) Prior to using program monies, a school district or charter school shall submit a plan to the State Board of Education for reading proficiency improvement that incorporates the following components:
  - i) assessment;
  - ii) intervention strategies;
  - iii) professional development;
  - iv) reading performance standards; and
  - v) specific measurable goals that are based upon gain scores.
- b) The State Board of Education shall provide model plans which a school district or charter school may use, or the district or school may develop its own plan.
- c) Plans developed by a school district or charter school shall be approved by the State Board of Education.
- 5) There is created within the K-3 Reading Achievement Program three funding programs:
  - a) the Base Level Program;
  - b) the Guarantee Program; and
  - c) the Low Income Students Program.
- 6) Monies appropriated to the State Board of Education for the K-3 Reading Improvement Program shall be allocated to the three funding programs as follows:
  - a) 8% to the Base Level Program;
  - b) 46% to the Guarantee Program; and
  - c) 46% to the Low Income Students Program.
- 7) a) To participate in the Base Level Program, a school district or charter school shall submit a reading proficiency improvement plan to the State Board of Education as provided in Subsection (4) and must receive approval of the plan from the board.
- b) i) Each school district qualifying for Base Level Program funds and the qualifying elementary charter schools combined shall receive a base amount.
- ii) The base amount for the qualifying elementary charter schools combined shall be allocated among each school in an amount proportionate to:
  - A) each existing charter school's prior year fall enrollment in grades kindergarten through grade 3; and
  - B) each new charter school's estimated fall enrollment in grades kindergarten through grade 3.
- 8) a) A school district that applies for program monies in excess of the Base Level Program funds shall choose to first participate in either the Guarantee Program or the Low Income Students Program.
- b) A school district must fully participate in either the Guarantee Program or the Low Income Students Program before it may elect to either fully or partially participate in the other program.
- c) To fully participate in the Guarantee Program, a school district shall:
  - i) levy a tax rate of .000056 under Section 53A-17a-151;



- ii) allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, equal to the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000056; or
  - iii) levy a tax under Section 53A-17a-151 and allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, so that the total revenue from the combined revenue sources equals the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000056.
- d) To fully participate in the Low Income Students Program, a school district shall:
  - i) levy a tax rate of .000065 under Section 53A-17a-151;
  - ii) allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, equal to the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000065; or
  - iii) levy a tax under Section 53A-17a-151 and allocate to the program other monies available to the school district, except monies provided by the state, so that the total revenue from the combined revenue sources equals the amount of revenue that would be generated by a tax rate of .000065.
- 9) a) A school district that fully participates in the Guarantee Program shall receive state funds in an amount that is:
  - i) equal to the difference between \$21 times the district's total WPUs and the revenue the school district is required to generate or allocate under Subsection (8)(c) to fully participate in the Guarantee Program; and
  - ii) not less than \$0.
- b) An elementary charter school shall receive under the Guarantee Program an amount equal to \$21 times the school's total WPUs.
- 10) The State Board of Education shall distribute Low Income Students Program funds in an amount proportionate to the number of students in each school district or charter school who qualify for free or reduced price school lunch multiplied by two.
- 11) A school district that partially participates in the Guarantee Program or Low Income Students Program shall receive program funds based on the amount of district revenue generated for or allocated to the program as a percentage of the amount of revenue that could have been generated or allocated if the district had fully participated in the program.
- 12) a) Each school district and charter school shall use program monies for reading proficiency improvement in grades kindergarten through grade three.
- b) Program monies may not be used to supplant funds for existing programs, but may be used to augment existing programs.
- 13) a) Each school district and charter school shall annually submit a report to the State Board of Education accounting for the expenditure of program monies in accordance with its plan for reading proficiency improvement.
- b) If a school district or charter school uses program monies in a manner that is inconsistent with Subsection (12), the school district or charter school is liable for reimbursing the State Board of Education for the amount of program monies improperly used, up to the amount of program monies received from the State Board of Education.

- 14) a) The State Board of Education shall make rules to implement the program.
  - b) i) The rules under Subsection (14)(a) shall require each school district or charter school to annually report progress in meeting goals stated in the district's or charter school's plan for student reading proficiency as measured by gain scores.
  - ii) If a school district or charter school does not meet or exceed the goals, the school district or charter school shall prepare a new plan that corrects deficiencies. The new plan must be approved by the State Board of Education before the school district or charter school receives an allocation for the next year.
- 15) If after 36 months of program operation, a school district fails to meet goals stated in the district's plan for student reading proficiency as measured by gain scores, the school district shall terminate any levy imposed under Section 53A-17a-151.

Section 2. Section 53A-17a-151 is enacted to read:

53A-17a-151. Board leeway for reading improvement.

- 1) Each local school board may levy a tax rate of up to .000121 per dollar of taxable value for funding the school district's K-3 Reading Improvement Program created under Section 53A-17a-150.
- 2) The levy authorized under this section:
  - a) is in addition to any other levy or maximum rate;
  - b) does not require voter approval; and
  - c) may be modified or terminated by a majority vote of the board.
- 3) A local school board shall establish its board-approved levy under this section by June 1 to have the levy apply to the fiscal year beginning July 1 in that same calendar year.

Section 3. Appropriation.

- 1) There is appropriated from the Uniform School Fund to the State Board of Education for the K-3 Reading Improvement Program:
  - a) \$2,500,000 for fiscal year 2004-05 only; and
  - b) as an ongoing appropriation subject to future budget constraints, \$12,500,000 for fiscal year 2004-05.
- 2) It is the intent of the Legislature that, subject to future budget constraints, the appropriation under Subsection (1)(a) shall be converted to an ongoing appropriation.

## APPENDIX B: S.B. 230 State and Local Funding, FY2005 and FY2006\*

DISTRICT	FY2005 STATE	FY2005 LOCAL	FY2005 TOTAL	FY2006 STATE	FY2006 LOCAL	FY2006 TOTAL
Alpine	\$1,451,657	\$1,076,437	\$2,528,094	\$1,262,643	\$1,037,771	\$2,300,414
Beaver	\$61,901	\$31,220	\$93,121	\$51,522	\$27,132	\$78,654
Box Elder	\$386,588	\$264,752	\$651,340	\$333,154	\$266,357	\$599,511
Cache	\$461,017	\$255,807	\$716,824	\$403,788	\$269,658	\$673,446
Carbon	\$123,269	\$176,848	\$300,117	\$101,633	\$161,531	\$263,164
Daggett	\$30,702	\$12,334	\$43,036	\$25,641	\$12,140	\$37,781
Davis	\$1,597,988	\$1,283,811	\$2,881,799	\$1,472,776	\$1,150,100	\$2,622,876
Duchesne	\$197,236	\$95,054	\$292,290	\$164,601	\$105,359	\$269,960
Emery Co.	\$82,789	\$53,521	\$136,310	\$68,890	\$44,500	\$113,390
Garfield	\$79,197	\$43,872	\$123,069	\$67,445	\$39,559	\$107,004
Grand	\$69,408	\$70,538	\$139,946	\$56,564	\$66,351	\$122,915
Granite	\$2,207,231	\$2,067,486	\$4,274,717	\$1,865,309	\$2,021,313	\$3,886,622
Iron Co.	\$261,331	\$246,749	\$508,080	\$218,155	\$242,003	\$460,158
Jordan	\$1,670,377	\$1,657,157	\$3,327,534	\$1,397,489	\$1,665,042	\$3,062,531
Juab	\$59,372	\$26,526	\$85,898	\$51,717	\$29,027	\$80,744
Kane Co.	\$69,897	\$60,304	\$130,201	\$54,235	\$61,122	\$115,357
Logan City	\$217,951	\$182,876	\$400,827	\$181,584	\$185,424	\$367,008
Millard	\$90,051	\$169,249	\$259,300	\$74,928	\$155,191	\$230,119
Morgan	\$73,662	\$48,836	\$122,498	\$61,965	\$47,422	\$109,387
Murray	\$158,011	\$199,821	\$357,832	\$124,191	\$199,693	\$323,884
Nebo	\$758,280	\$491,876	\$1,250,156	\$699,208	\$467,873	\$1,167,081
No. Sanpete	\$128,678	\$57,633	\$186,311	\$110,094	\$57,086	\$167,180
No. Summit	\$29,268	\$0	\$29,268	\$24,390	\$0	\$24,390
Ogden City	\$603,176	\$330,725	\$933,901	\$495,261	\$362,365	\$857,626
Park City	\$37,200	\$7,932	\$45,132	\$43,917	\$19,527	\$63,444
Piute	\$52,215	\$7,511	\$59,726	\$45,961	\$7,610	\$53,571
Provo	\$432,851	\$451,383	\$884,234	\$383,981	\$407,713	\$791,694
Rich	\$29,268	\$0	\$29,268	\$24,390	\$0	\$24,390
Salt Lake City	\$669,727	\$1,355,459	\$2,025,186	\$556,899	\$1,369,948	\$1,926,847
San Juan	\$211,027	\$57,856	\$268,883	\$182,272	\$57,672	\$239,944
Sevier	\$211,671	\$97,798	\$309,469	\$181,328	\$103,034	\$284,362
So. Sanpete	\$160,271	\$49,601	\$209,872	\$143,401	\$47,613	\$191,014
So. Summit	\$40,340	\$77,097	\$117,437	\$33,596	\$69,768	\$103,364
Tintic	\$48,960	\$3,627	\$52,587	\$41,214	\$3,149	\$44,363
Tooele	\$388,594	\$227,787	\$616,381	\$352,154	\$246,726	\$598,880
Uintah	\$202,732	\$234,540	\$437,272	\$167,007	\$222,866	\$389,873
Wasatch	\$78,262	\$48,994	\$127,256	\$65,126	\$40,736	\$105,862
Washington	\$524,136	\$672,698	\$1,196,834	\$421,425	\$690,079	\$1,111,504
Wayne	\$59,289	\$19,741	\$79,030	\$50,643	\$20,216	\$70,859
Weber	\$836,356	\$611,754	\$1,448,110	\$747,082	\$572,353	\$1,319,435
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$14,851,936</b>	<b>\$12,827,210</b>	<b>\$27,679,146</b>	<b>\$12,807,579</b>	<b>\$12,553,029</b>	<b>\$25,360,608</b>

\*Figures provided to WestEd by USOE in October 2005. Funding totals for fiscal year 2006 are preliminary.

CHARTERS	FY2005 TOTAL	FY2006 TOTAL
American Achieve Academy	-	\$26,005
American Preparatory Academy	\$15,316	\$12,837
APA West	-	\$12,266
Freedom Academy	\$17,324	\$14,013
John Hancock	\$9,561	\$8,012
Lincoln Academy	-	\$11,348
Moab Community	\$2,076	\$1,815
North Davis Preparatory Academy	\$15,591	\$12,116
North Star Academy	-	\$10,767
Odyssey	-	\$9,748
Ogden Preparatory Academy	\$17,019	\$13,943
Pinnacle Canyon Academy	\$19,475	\$16,311
Ranches	\$11,366	\$8,876
Reagan Academy	-	\$15,734
Soldier Hollow School	-	\$1,971
Summit	\$16,184	\$12,979
Thomas Edison	\$10,983	\$9,082
Thomas Edison South	-	\$9,543
Timpanogos Academy	\$13,169	\$10,717
Wasatch Peak Academy	-	\$8,411
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$148,064</b>	<b>\$226,494</b>



WestEd®

*Excellence in research, development, and service*